NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW

No. DCXXVI.

JANUARY, 1908.

THE GREAT MINDS OF AMERICA.

III.—DAVID J. BREWER.

THE REVIEW is considering some of the greater of living men who, actually and potentially, are valuable to us, valuable as citizens who give to the public the best they have. The most beneficent power that any man possesses, as Justice Brewer has said in one of his many addresses to the young men of our schools, is brain power. We do not mean, by brain power, mental activity expressed in a rapid procession of intellectual impressions, manifestations that are as quick as the shuttles which weave the perishable cloth; we mean the slow and patient power of the discoverers and the defenders of truth; of the scientists who search and find the everlasting secrets of nature; of the philosophers who compose great pictures of the universe; of the publicists who deal with men and their governments in the simple ways of greatness, whose very simplicity leads to criticism of them by men to whom quiet often denotes inefficiency, publicists who know the impotence as well as the value of human laws, who never forget that the law of nature is unrepealable by statutes, that the greatness of a state is to be found in the minds and characters of its citizens, and that its material expansion is often far from being a blessing.

We present in this number Justice Brewer, of the United States Supreme Court, as one of the men of our time of great intel-

Copyright, 1907, by THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW PUBLISHING COMPANY. All Rights Reserved

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lectual power, a power which he employs in his important place and out of it for the advancement of the public welfare. In his place his words often determine the law; out of it they are the words of a thoughtful and wise citizen, and, therefore, they sink deep into the minds of serious men. Their influence may not be immediately felt, for the truth is often disregarded, while the sham triumphs, for the moment, among the thoughtless and the over-excited; but, in the end, the truth prevails simply because it is the truth. The men who utter words of wisdom, which are always words of truth, do not often occupy the first political places in a republic, as President Eliot has pointed out; but one of them will perform more lasting beneficent service, will do more to direct the thoughts of his fellows, and thus more to mould the institutions of the country, than all the place-holders of his time.

Justice Brewer has spoken and written upon a variety of topics, but we will concern ourselves in this brief article with his judicial contributions to the law of the Constitution, with his views of the relations that ought to exist between the general Government and the States, and with the advice which he has given to lawyers, young and old, fresh from the schools or experienced in practice.

Lawyers, in his mind, should be, as they have almost always been, the leaders of the people. We shall define this to mean the leaders in the making and executing as well as in the interpretation of laws. This is saying simply that the work of governing, in all its branches, should be performed by trained minds. Acuteness is not enough; quickness of apprehension is not sufficient, nor is the experience of a single life. The arts of party management will not satisfy the needs and demands of government. In the practice of such arts Disraeli dominated Gladstone, and Burr was master of both Jefferson and Hamilton. The difference between the two classes is marked by the shifty means for immediate ends of the one and the deep conviction and moral purpose of the other. Justice Brewer thinks of the lawyer who, like himself, makes and executes and interprets the law for the doing of justice as justice is done, roughly enough, it may be true, but still honestly and righteously by trained men who know how law has grown from the sources, whose experience is that of the long centuries during which this growth has been made, who

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

are, therefore, familiar with the need of consistent and enduring, as well as practical, rules for the guidance of human conduct and for the remedying of ills that affect the state. The lawyers, he will say, made and interpreted the Constitution; built up our federal system; and, as a class, they alone have the knowledge that is essential to the successful working of the state they have constructed. There are others than lawyers, of course, who have been distinguished and useful statesmen. In England, for example, there is a class besides, and, in some respects, better trained than lawyers for their tasks; but in this country the lawyers are the only class of men who necessarily are learned in the art of legislation; there are other statesmen than lawyers, but there is no other single class to which we may go for statesmen. The other statesmen, however, would not be fit for their tasks if they did not recognize the value of expert assistance; the President who is a layman and who would be his own lawyer, draw his own bills, insist upon his own interpretation of the Constitution and the laws against the advice of the experts, or in contradiction of them, would not be one of the worthy exceptions to whom allusion has been made.

Admitting that Justice Brewer is correct, and that, in this republic at least, the community will naturally look to the lawyer for leadership, what are the teachings of this member of the profession, of this influential justice of our highest court?

In the first place, he has spoken more upon the duties of his profession and upon the duties of citizenship than any other justice during the century and more of the court's existence; moreover, in his addresses, he has been as free from partisanship as he has been in his judicial opinions, one of which at least is worthy of Chief-Justice Marshall in his best days.

Then we come to the teachings themselves. There has been a theory held, and recently advanced, that the Constitution is changeable, or developing, and that, in interpreting it, the court must obey the behests, or yield to the temper, of the time. This is the crude expression of a mind which misunderstands a truth. The Constitution does, indeed, develop; but its growth comes by the application of its fundamental and unchanging principles to new conditions made by the advance of commerce, of arts, of invention, to improved, and constantly improving, social conditions. If the Constitution be, indeed, changed in any respect, it

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

must be done by amendment. Justice Brewer recognizes the influence of the thought of the people upon the Supreme Court in this kind of development; it is the influence of the age upon the thoughts of judges as well as of other men; but the thought that moves so vitally is not a disputed thought, especially a thought that is the subject of partisan debate; it is the deliberate thought of the whole people, the spirit of the age. It is best illustrated by the history of the interpretations of the commerce clause. In the earlier day, the court announced that navigation was commerce; in the later day, it included railroads, telegraphs, and all the modern instrumentalities of intercourse. One class of men would have the court change the commerce clause in order to bring production within the regulating power of the Federal Government, or to transform regulation into complete control. To accomplish this by judicial construction would be to violate the Constitution, and to recognize the violation as an acceptance of the popular thought, while in fact it would be a dishonorable yielding to the loud demands of a faction.

In his address before the Virginia State Bar Association, which was delivered in 1906, Justice Brewer called attention to the theory advanced by the President and by Mr. Root, that the meaning of the Constitution could be changed by judicial construction; in other words, that it might be amended by the Supreme Court, which, under Marshall, had constituted itself, and since has been accepted, as the defender of the Constitution against the possible encroachments of the political power. Here was offered a great opportunity to such a man as Justice Brewer, and his reply was crushing, for he demonstrated that the adoption of such a heresy would destroy the Federal Government, would transform it into a national republic like France, for example, putting to death the Constitution, while the Government of enumerated powers would become a "government with all the powers vested in the legislative and executive authorities of the nation; and the Tenth Amendment, which reserves to the people what they have not in terms granted, would become a voiceless and unmeaning part of the Constitution."

Clearly and convincingly he has taught those who have listened to him and heeded him that the national power has been expanded as greatly as it ought to be. Throughout the two periods of our constitutional history—that before the War of Secession,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in which the national stability was established, and that after the war, when, by the adoption of the amendments, especially the Fourteenth Amendment, the national power was enormously expanded—the Supreme Court has been the brake upon the Government wagon, holding back the political power from obtaining its partisan or personal ends, or from gratifying its notions through violation of the Constitution, or through pretending to read into its provisions meanings that are not there.

Justice Brewer, then, believes in the Federal Government, partly because he has respect for the laws—the law of the Constitution being higher to him than the law of the statutes or the whims of an Executive—and partly because he thinks that the federal system is essential to the good government, and, therefore, to the happiness of the country. He believes that the remoteness of a Central Government from the people would put an end to their vigilance, and would, therefore, eventually deprive them of that political instinct which exists only among those who exercise political power and discharge political duties. He condemns the growing habit of appealing to the National Government for relief against ills that should be borne, or when remedied should be corrected by the community immediately injured. He has no respect for the dominating idea that efficiency is the sole standard for a republican, or democratic, government, for, he says, if efficiency is the only test, "then a centralized government with a dictator is the ideal government." In illustration of the tendency of the time towards centralization, he recalls recent incidents at Washington,—the swinging of the Executive whip, for example, over the House of Representatives in order to compel the passage of a Statehood bill, an activity quite in keeping with the supremacy of the party boss and the party machine. The "most glorious product of our civilization," he says, "is not the entrancing beauty of the Capitol, the magnificence, wealth or extravagance of the Government, its ironclads or its army, its wonderful system of railroads, its marvellous manufacturing, mining and other interests, but rather the individual's possession of an independent, conscientious, public-spirited citizenship." He warns us, too, against proposed further encroachments upon the powers and functions of the State for the increase of the federal powers, with the consequent degradation of the individual.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The proper control of government by the people is necessarily postulated on the maintenance of local power in the people. This is the central thought that lies at the foundation of his reasoning about the relative powers and places of the Nation and the State. To thousands of young men he has imparted golden lessons, in which is recognized the divine worthiness of the individual, for his insistence upon the dominance of the State over its affairs, the control of the city over its interests, follows from his conception that the man is the father of the State; that the State exists for him, not he for the State; that the value of the State depends upon the jealousy of the citizen for his own rights, his observance of his political duties, while his civic manliness depends upon his refusal to lean upon the State as paternalism would have him lean. The welfare of individuals is not dependent upon uniformity of habits, neither is the welfare of the States dependent upon uniformity of laws regulating their domestic concerns. Each community should be free to judge of its own needs, of its own desires, and the nation should be confined to the care of the common interests. The moral and mental vigor of the citizen should not be allowed to become debilitated by a paternalism which relieves him of the need of watchfulness, of industry, of thought. These are a few of the teachings of one of the foremost minds in the country. As a judge, speaking for the whole court, in Kansas *vs.* Colorado, recently decided, Justice Brewer defined the freedom of the States from the control of the Federal Government, and its own sovereignty over its affairs, in an opinion which, as we have already said, is worthy of Chief-Justice Marshall. As a citizen, he has spoken many times for the manhood of the individual which has been, and continues to be, threatened by an enervating paternalism. Long after impressions made in haste or in excited moments have been effaced, or are remembered with bitter self-reproaches by those who heeded them to their own and, perhaps, to the community's harm, the words of Justice Brewer will be accepted as truths uttered by a man of a careful, trained and thoughtful mind.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

IS THE PAPACY AN OBSTACLE TO THE REUNION OF CHRISTENDOM?

BY THE MOST REVEREND JOHN IRELAND, ARCHBISHOP OF ST. PAUL.

IN THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW of September, Professor Charles A. Briggs contributes a second article on the question—"Is the Papacy an Obstacle to the Reunion of Christendom?" I beg leave to offer to the pages of the REVIEW a reply to this second article.

It is a pleasure to break a lance in the controversial arena with Professor Briggs. A doughty champion of his cause, putting to best profit the arguments which, he assumes, tell in its favor, he remains, throughout, the courteous, the fair-minded and the fair-hearted knight from whom his opponent, in the very midst of the fray, dares not withhold respect and friendliest regard. For my part, I must hope that I shall not fall too far below the high standard which the Professor sets before me.

The Papacy is a stupendous fact in history: none can ignore it: all must feel interested in what may be said of it by friend or foe.

The universal episcopate of St. Peter, and of his successors in the Church of Christ, is freely and fully accepted by Professor Briggs. In his first article, among other reasons for his belief he quotes the text in the sixteenth chapter of St. Matthew: "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church." He says: "All attempts to explain the 'rock' in any other way than as referring to Peter have ignominiously failed."

Nothing more true. The statement of the Professor, however, has been contested by Bishop Doane, of Albany. The Bishop would have us remark the distinction to be made between "*Petra*," the Rock, and "*Petros*," the name given to Simon. The answer is readily at hand. Without asking why the Greek inter-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

preter, and later the Latin, clung closely to the rules of grammatical gender, using the masculine form, when the word serves as a proper noun, and the feminine, when it refers more directly to the metaphor of the "rock" or foundation-stone, we need only remember that in the language of the Lord Himself, who spoke the Aramaic or Syro-Chaldaic, there was no diversity of form. The Syriac version of the Gospel which is of very early date, and makes use of a language necessarily of near affinity with the Aramaic, gives in both clauses the word "*Kipha.*" The Bishop further reminds us that, in the writings of the Fathers, we find different interpretations of "Petra," as the word occurs in the second clause of the sentence—"Petra" being explained not only of the person of Peter, but, also, of Christ Himself, or of the faith which Peter confessed, or of the faith committed to and professed by the Catholic Church. The Bishop argues that, since the word receives different interpretations, we have no right to assume as primary and authoritative the interpretation which sees in "Petra" the person of Peter. But does the word, read in its obvious meaning, admit of different interpretations? The text speaks unmistakably for itself. To give to it any other meaning than that which refers it to the person of Peter is to recede from the simplest rules of grammar, to ignore the whole bearing of the demonstrative pronoun "this"—"Thou art *Kipha,* and on *this Kipha* I will build my Church." Such is the judgment of writers, not Catholic, who, caring little for the supremacy of Peter, are, however, scrupulous as to the correct meaning of words and sentences. The Lutheran Rosenmuller (*"Comment. in S. Matthaeum"*) writes:

"The 'rock' is neither the confession of Peter, nor Christ pointing out Himself by his finger or a shake of the head—which interpretations the context does not admit—but Peter himself."

H. J. Holtzman, Professor of Exegesis in the Protestant Faculty of Theology, Strassburg, says:

"Isaias, 28: 16.—God lays a foundation-stone in Sion; and Abraham in Jewish theology often figures as the rock on which God built the world—Isaias, 51: 12. Peter is to be such a rock for the Church: the term is applied to the person of Peter. Therein are Catholic interpreters absolutely in the right in comparison with the old Protestants who saw the rock only in the faith, or in the profession of faith made by Peter—Peter, the *oikonomos,* 'the key-bearer,' in the house that is

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

built, as Jesus Himself is in the house of His Father (Apoc. 3: 7). Again in any case the ecclesiastical consciousness expressed in this passage is a fundamentally Catholic one."

W. P. Armstrong ("Dictionary of Christ and the Gospel," Article "Cæsarea Philippi") says:

"Upon this rock Jesus now affirms his intention of founding His Church: not upon any rock, and therefore not simply upon a strong and firm foundation, but upon *this* rock indicated by the name of Peter. . . . The rock intended by Jesus to be the future foundation of His Church, is Peter. The function thus assigned to Peter is, indeed, not apart from his confession, nor is the fact that he evidently spoke in a representative capacity to be overlooked. The address of Jesus, however, is distinctly to Peter, and it is his name that is interpreted. The confession which precedes is, indeed, closely related to the words of Jesus; but it cannot be understood as the rock-foundation intended by Jesus. In itself it furnishes the occasion rather than the ground of the promise of Jesus. It therefore cannot be treated abstractedly as something separated from Peter."

The diverse interpretations of the "*Petra*" occurring in the writings of the Fathers, rightly read and balanced one with the other, put no difficulty in our way. Those diverse interpretations are met with chiefly among the Post-Nicene Fathers. The Post-Nicenes wrote more discursively and more metaphorically than did their predecessors; they were wont to seek out the reasons of things, to formulate conclusions and ultimate bearings. They were, also, much in the habit of ascribing to Scriptural passages what has been called "an accommodated sense"—suiting sacred words to given circumstances, to which the original meaning could not have had reference. And, so, there happened to be a diversity of interpretations, or, rather, of applications, of the text of Matthew. Now one Father, now another, would go back of the "rock," in quest of the origin of its solidity and other rocklike endowments; this was, of course, Christ, the Primary Rock, upon which all, who were to be strengthened, even Peter, must be built. They would inquire as to why special prerogatives were conferred upon Peter; the answer was—because of his unshaken faith, and of his public profession of his faith. Again, they would enlarge upon Peter's profession of faith, and remind their readers that only through and by means of a similar profession could the Apostolate and the Church live and endure through ages. In those ways the Fathers labored to draw out the fulness

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of truth, proximate and remote, which they believed to be wrapt up in the text. But, whatever other meanings were given to it, there was never an exclusion of the identification of the "Petra" with the person of Peter; frequently this identification is presupposed; frequently it is explicitly asserted—and by the self-same Fathers who at another time had admitted different interpretations. Interpretations other than the "Petrine" are to be met with—secondary renderings, explanations, illustrations. But, when we look through Patristic literature for the primary, the dogmatic, meaning of the word, we find it to be, very clearly so, *the person of Peter*. Grammatical construction and Patristic testimony give the same interpretation: "Thou art rock (*Kipha*) and on this rock (*Kipha*) I will build my church."

Professor Briggs is altogether right in his preliminary statement that all attempts to explain the "rock" in any other way than as referring to Peter have ignominiously failed. Here, however, he and I cease to be of one mind. I wrote:

> "Peter holds the keys of the Kingdom: he is the absolute master. Whatsoever he binds is bound; whatsoever he looses is loosed; his power extends over the whole sphere of the Kingdom, over all its activities; it is shortened by no power or right confided to others."

The Professor quotes words spoken by Christ to the Apostles collectively. The quotations are from John xx: 22, 23, "Receive the Holy Spirit; whatsoever sins ye remit, they shall be remitted . . ."; from Matthew xviii: 15--18, "Whatsoever sins ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in Heaven. . . ."; from Matthew xxviii: 18--20, "Go ye, therefore, and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them . . . teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you; and lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world." The Professor concludes:

> "It is evident, therefore, that the power of St. Peter and his successors was shortened by power and right given to the Apostolic ministry of the Church."

I reply: The power given to Peter was not shortened by words spoken to the Apostolic ministry of the Church. Concessions made to the entire Apostolic body do not annul or take away those made to Peter apart from the others, to Peter exclusively. Powers and rights which he receives in common with his brethren he will hold and use in common with them: but powers and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

rights which he alone receives he will hold and use as his peculiar possession.

The peculiar possession of Peter is marked out in the words spoken by Christ to Peter exclusively—words not repeated at a later moment to the Apostolic body: "Thou art rock, and on this rock I will build my Church"; "Feed my lambs, feed my sheep"; "Confirm thy brethren." Whatever of power and right was implied in these several words was given to Peter alone, and became the exclusive appanage of Peter. Peter alone is the rock; Peter alone feeds lambs and sheep; Peter alone confirms (strengthens) the brethren. No words spoken to the whole Apostolate relate to the grants made here to Peter; no words were spoken at other times that could in any way be supposed to "shorten" the authority given to Peter. All who are in the Church, Apostles included, are built on Peter: all who are in the Church are fed, are strengthened, by Peter. Peter rules and governs; he is the sovereign.

The power of binding and loosing, first given to Peter alone, was later given to the whole body. That of remitting sins, of baptizing and of teaching was given to the Apostles collectively. To Peter first and alone: "I will give to thee the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in Heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed also in Heaven." Later, to the Apostles collectively: "Amen, I say to you, whatsoever ye shall bind on earth, shall be bound in Heaven. . . ." Jesus put first in one Apostle what later He was to put in several. But what was done later did not alter the beginning, did not take away what previously had been conceded. The words to Peter had already brought under his government each one of those to whom afterwards it was said: "Whatever ye shall bind . . ." The promises of Jesus, as equally his gifts, are without repentance. I should further remark that the form of words to Peter was very different from that used later in addressing the Apostles collectively. To Peter it was said: "To thee I will give the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven. Whatsoever thou shalt bind . . ." In addressing the Apostles, Christ makes no grant of "keys." The concession to the Apostles is, clearly, far less comprehensive than that made to Peter alone. The absence of mention of "the keys," in the address to the Apostles, is most significant.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

From the form of the grant, the power to remit sins, to baptize, to teach, is a belonging of the whole Apostolic body. But in the words of the grant, assuredly, there is nothing to indicate that in the exercise of this power the several members are not subject to the direction of Peter—that the right of high government, previously and repeatedly given exclusively to him, was eliminated or shortened by any common right now conceded to all.

The grants of power made by Christ are of two kinds, each different from the other. Each kind must be carefully noticed, if we are to apprehend correctly the nature of the organism of the Church. There is the grant of the Apostolate to the whole Apostolic body; and there is that of the Princedom to Peter alone. All Apostles are teachers; all bind and loose; but, except Peter, none teach, none bind or loose independently; the brethren of Peter teach, bind or loose under his guidance; Peter alone is independent and unfettered, having a commission peculiar to himself, given to himself alone. Peter is Bishop and Apostle; so are the other members of the body; but, Peter, also, is Prince, Master and Governor. The Professor further writes:

"I fully recognize the primacy of St. Peter and his successors in the possession of the keys of the kingdom, but not their exclusive possession to this authority."

No claim is made in favor of an "exclusive possession" of the powers and rights of the Apostolate. All the Apostles have their due part in those powers and rights, so much so that they are essential elements in the Church and that Peter cannot set them aside, or dispense with their cooperation. But, with all this, the Princedom in Peter remains intact. It is not communicated to others. The Princedom is "exclusive" and, therefore, is not "shortened" through powers or rights possessed by others.

As to the testimony of early ecclesiastical history, regarding the rights and authority of the Papacy, Professor Briggs says:

"The primitive Church does not favor, but condemns with no uncertain voice, the claims for an unlimited jurisdiction of the Pope."

As to "an unlimited jurisdiction," what Catholics hold is that the Pope, the Successor of Peter, as teacher and lawmaker, is supreme over the Church, over members and ministers, bishops included, singly and collectively. Bishops, in virtue of their office, have no right to overrule the official acts of the Pope, to set them-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

selves against him, to teach or legislate in opposition to him. In other terms, the Pope is Monarch of the Church. It is not, however, to be supposed that Catholic faith allows the Pope to alter or transform the Church, or anything in the Church that is of divine ordering; the Pope is the Vicar of Christ, with no right over the appointments of his Principal. Nor can the Pope alter or transform the official teachings of Œcumenical Councils, or of his own predecessors; this would be to deny the doctrinal inerrancy with which Catholic faith holds those official teachings to be endowed. It were otherwise with the legislation of Councils or of predecessors; legislation is temporary in its purpose, and no claim to infallibility is made in its favor.

In matters of practical administration the Pope is not infallible. Hence, most loyal subjects of the Papacy, submissive to its authority, ready to accept unreservedly its final rulings, may take, and, as history shows, not seldom do take, the liberty to offer counsel to the Pope, or to make respectful remonstrance. Counsels or remonstrances are no denial of authority, and imply no refusal of obedience.

In estimating the testimony of history as regards the Papacy, no overweening importance is to be attached to acts of disobedience, momentary or continuous, from one or from several. Acts of disobedience there are in every social organism. The sole pertinent question in such cases is whether the disobedience means a denial of authority, or whether the denial, if such there were, is of a character to offset other and different facts and testimonies to be gathered from the records of history. The teachings of history are seen in its broad continuous stream—not in occasional bubblings of disturbance, not in manifest departures from the general trend and flow.

Paul withstood Peter as likely, by his attitude towards Jewish ceremonials, to scandalize the Gentiles. Did Paul in this instance deny Peter's Princedom and leadership? The incident bore upon a private act of Peter, not upon his official teaching. Was the opposition of the Bishops of the Orient to the ruling of Victor, in the matter of Easter celebration, a denial of his superior jurisdiction, or merely a difference of judgment as to a particular fact, a temporary outburst of anger at seeing an old custom suddenly abrogated? That Victor was the master is more than intimated in the subsequent fact that his ruling became the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

recognized law in the Orient as well as in the Occident. There is even every reason to believe that the very bishops who at first protested ended by accepting the Papal decision. When Irenæus, of Lyons, "fittingly admonished" Victor, there was certainly in the words of Irenæus no indication, as the Professor would have us think, that he deemed the Bishop of Rome "guilty of an intrusion into the rights and privileges of the Bishops of Asia," or that Victor was not the chieftain to whom ultimately acquiescence should be given. The letter of Irenæus was one of respectful counsel, such as, in a similar circumstance, any Bishop of the present day would deem himself entitled to write to Pius X. Indeed, the Latin phrase, "*decenter admonuit,*" usually translated into "fittingly admonished," is rendered more correctly by the expression "respectfully admonished." Dionysius, Bishop of Alexandria, it is said, "writes to the Bishop of Rome as to a brother seeking advice; not as to a superior looking for a command." The Professor should not have called into the controversy the case of Dionysius; it tells strongly against his contention. Dionysius was Bishop of Alexandria, A.D. 247--265 In a letter written against Sabellianism, he taught the real subordination of the Son to the Father. He was denounced to Rome. The Pope, Dionysius, convoked a synod and addressed to him a letter in the name of the synod and in his own. In addition he wrote a private letter, asking the Bishop to explain his sayings. The Bishop answered by a treatise in four books, "Accusation and Defence," which seems to have satisfied the Pope. Newman ("Development of Dogma") cites the Dionysian incident in support of the primacy. As to the case of Cyprian of Carthage, I shall simply remark that, in justice to his illustrious life-record, Cyprian should not be taken at his worst. Pope Stephen had decided, as against Cyprian, that baptism given by heretics is valid. Cyprian lost his temper, and appealed to other bishops from the sentence of Stephen—not even then denying in principle the Princedom of Stephen. That the authority of Stephen was recognized in the Church at large is seen from the fact that the Church at large followed Stephen, not Cyprian. Better that we read Cyprian in his calm, undisturbed mood, when he preaches the absolute necessity of unity with the See of Peter: "The Church founded by Christ our Lord upon Peter, for an original and principle of unity—From whom [Peter] he

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

appointed and showed that unity should spring." Better with St. Augustine to assume that the breach between Cyprian and Stephen was never complete, that, later, most likely, Cyprian corrected his error. Better, with the same Augustine, to pass over "those things which in irritation he had poured out against Stephen," "remembering his martyrdom endured within the unity of the Church."

The great stream of testimony, recorded in early ecclesiastical history, tells unmistakably of Papal supremacy. Professor Briggs writes:

> "The Pope now claims the exclusive right to summon Christian Councils; but all the primitive Councils, all those recognized as valid by other Christian Churches than Rome, were summoned by the Emperor and not by the Pope: and none of them recognized the supreme legislative and judicial functions of the Popes, but exercised those functions themselves even to the extent of condemning a Pope as heretical."

This is a strong statement. If founded in history, it demolishes the Papacy. But is it not the reverse of what the history of the primitive Councils clearly teaches?

As a matter of fact, Emperors often did convoke Councils; but Emperors had no canonical or ecclesiastical right to do so. Councils convoked by Emperors looked to the Bishops of Rome for supreme guidance, deemed themselves subject to him in their deliberations, confessed that without him their acts were of no avail, and waited upon him for confirmation and ratification of the decrees they had enacted. The history of the early Councils gives evidence most indubitable in favor of Papal supremacy.

The records of the Council of Nicæa have perished. The tradition about it, however, sustains Papal authority. In the same Fourth Century, Pope Damasus and a synod of ninety bishops in Rome declared that the 318 bishops of Nicæa were directed from the City of the most holy Bishops of Rome; and a later synod of Rome, A.D. 483, states that the 318 bishops assembled in Nicæa "referred the confirmation of things and the authority to the Holy Roman Catholic Church." Osius of Cordova, in Spain, presided over the Council. His See marked out for him no special pre-eminence; it may well be presumed that his authority came to him as the delegate of Pope Sylvester. What was at the time the recognized law of the Church as to the presidency of Councils, we learn from the historian Socrates, who wrote in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Constantinople within the Fourth Century. Socrates sets aside a synod held in Antioch as having no authority because, "Julius, Bishop of the great Rome, was not there, nor had he sent a substitute, although an ecclesiastical canon commands that the Churches shall not make any ordinances against the opinion of the Bishops of Rome."

The first Council of Constantinople need not be considered; it was a local assembly, of which little is known, gaining its title of Œcumenical from the later acceptance by the Church of the creed attributed to it.

The Council of Ephesus was brought on by the heresy of Nestorius. Before the Council had been convoked, Cyril of Alexandria had reported Nestorius to Pope Celestine—"old ecclesiastical custom," he wrote, "obliging him to do so." The reply of Celestine was imperious. Cyril is to take to himself the authority of the Roman See and, unless Nestorius recant within ten days, to cut him off from the Church. The Patriarch of Alexandria promotes and executes the mandate of the Pope; the Patriarch of Antioch admits that it must be obeyed in spite of its severity. Nestorius was prejudged by the Pope; and the judgment of the Pope was accepted in the Orient. When Nestorius arrived at Ephesus the Bishop of the city, Memnon, shut its churches to him; other bishops arriving there rejected him as a reprobate. The Council being assembled, its first act was to exclude Nestorius from its sessions and to deprive him of episcopal dignity—"We being necessarily impelled thereto by the canons and the letter of the Most Holy Father and colleague, Celestine, Bishop of the Roman Church." Cyril, to whom previously Celestine had remitted the whole case of Nestorius, presided. The further acts of the Council are reported in a long letter to the Pope. Celestine having meanwhile died, his successor Xystus confirmed the Council.

Next was the heresy of Eutyches. A Council is held at Ephesus. The Pope sent thither a letter called "The Tome" defining the faith. The "Tome" was not read; Eutyches was absolved. Leo declared the Council null and void, and it passed into history as "The Robber Council." Later Leo deposed the Patriarch of Constantinople, and excommunicated those who at Ephesus had upheld Eutyches. Among those excommunicated were the Patriarchs of Alexandria and Jerusalem and most of the princi-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pal Metropolitans of the East. The Council of Chalcedon followed. The Legate of the Pope presided. The declaration of the Council as to the presidency is most significant—the "acts" stating that Leo, as Head, held through his Legates "the hegemony," the delegates of the Emperor having "the presidency of honor." At the very beginning, the Legate Baschasinus announced that he had an order "from the Bishop of Rome, who is the head of all the Churches," "that Discorus, Patriarch of Alexandria, should not take part in the Council." Discorus was obliged to sit as an accused. When Leo's "Tome" was read, the bishops cried: "This is the faith of the Fathers. It is Peter who has spoken thus to Leo." Finally the Council asked from the Pope the confirmation of its acts.

The Second Council of Constantinople was not considered valid by Emperor or by Bishops, until Pope Vigilius had confirmed it.

The Third Council of Constantinople, in condemning the Monothelite errors, condemned, also, the Pope to whom Professor Briggs makes allusion, Honorius. To judge what at the time of this Council was thought in the Orient of the authority of the Bishop of Rome, we may recall the words of a contemporary, St. Maximus, a monk of Constantinople, who has always been regarded as a great saint, and one of the most noted of Byzantine writers. Speaking of Pyrrhus, the Metropolitan of Constantinople, the arch-heretic, Maximus says:

> "For we speak in vain—who do not satisfy and implore the blessed Pope of the Romans, that is, the Apostolic See, which from the Incarnate Word, and also from all the holy synods, has received universal and supreme dominion, authority and power of binding and loosing over all the holy Churches of God in the whole world."

To the Third Council of Constantinople, Pope Agatho sent a dogmatic letter, which it "faithfully accepted," adding, however, the name of Honorius to the list of condemned heretics. In their letter to the Emperor, the Bishops wrote: "The ancient city of Rome offered to you a divinely written confession. . . . By Agatho, Peter spoke." The Legate of the Pope presided. At the conclusion, the Bishops wrote to the Pope, "occupying the first See of the Universal Church," and begged him to confirm their decisions, which the successor of Agatho, Leo II, duly ratified, changing, however, the wording so far as it referred to Honorius

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

—thereby giving proof of his supreme authority. Instead of simply leaving the name of Honorius on the list of condemned heretics, where the Council had put it, Leo wrote to the Emperor:

"We anathematize . . . and, also, Honorius, who did not illumine this Apostolic See with the doctrine of the Apostolic tradition, but permitted the immaculate to be stained by impious faithlessness."

The condemnation of Honorius offers no contradiction to Papal supremacy. Papal supremacy bears upon official and *ex-cathedra* acts; the condemnation of Honorius had reference to a private letter, devoid of *ex-cathedra* features. His fault had been purely personal—one of neglect of duty. Instead of writing a private letter, vague and uncertain in tone, he should have sent to the Orient a clear-cut, definite condemnation of the rising heresy.

Neither Scripture nor ecclesiastical history affords evidence of limitations put upon Papal supremacy by rights or privileges of others. Throughout, the Papacy remains a plenary and complete Monarchy—in the words of St. Maximus, "the universal and supreme dominion, authority and power of binding and loosing over all the holy churches of God in the whole world." The supremacy of the Papacy, such as is to-day claimed for it, is that which Scripture and history allow.

The Bishop of Rome being the Supreme visible Head of the Church, it follows that he is the centre of Catholic unity, that union with him is the condition and the token of membership in the visible body of the Church.

Professor Briggs returns to the theory of the "three constituents necessary to complete unity"—"the Pope, the ministry and the people"—this time laying special emphasis on the "people." He says:

"But a society, whether Christian or otherwise, is something more than the physical organism of the human body. Such a society, as history and experience show, may exist without an executive, or even without a ministerial body. The only thing that is absolutely essential is the people that constitute its membership. They may combine in themselves all the functions of government, except so far as they may delegate these to temporary representatives. For a social organism the head is the least important of the three: the head and the ministry will perish without the people, but the society may live on without them if such a necessity should arise."

The Professor will permit me to say that this paragraph reveals his radical error in the estimate of the conditions of Cath-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

olic unity; the Church is put on a level with civil society. All that the Professor says of civil society is true. There, the power of governing, primarily delegated by the Creator to the people, is, in turn, delegated by the people to the chosen executive; the only thing absolutely essential in civil society is the people. Far different, however, is the case when the Society of Christ, the Church, is brought into question. Here, authority is delegated directly and immediately to the Head—to Peter. The Head is the Chief, the essential thing in the Church. As the Head appointed by Christ is to have enduring life and do enduring work, it will never be deprived of other social constituents, ministers and people. But so many of the ministers or of the people as choose to separate themselves from the Head no longer belong to the Church; they are in schism; they are outside the fold; the divine command is that, singly and severally, they return at once to unity, by proffering their allegiance to Peter—"That all may be one as the Father and I are one."

It is true, as the Professor remarks, that all baptized persons are in a manner members of the Church, subject to its jurisdiction; but only are they such in the sense that rebels and schismatics are members of the society from which they are cut off. It is true, also, that, in certain Churches separated from Rome, bishops and priests are recognized as having valid orders; but, they, too, are rebels and schismatics—outside the fold, under obligation to return to unity. Of course, when I speak of members of separated Churches as rebels and schismatics, and repeat to them the obligation incumbent upon them to return to unity, I speak of matters as they exist "*in foro externo.*" As to the responsibility of each one "*in foro interno,*" I do not decide; of the inner conscience God alone is the judge.

An authoritative declaration from Rome, in 1865, bearing upon the so-called "Branch Theory," deserves to be quoted:

1 "The unity of the Church is absolute and indivisible; the Church has never lost, nor for so much as a moment of time can it ever lose, its unity.

2 "The Church of Christ is indefectible, not only in duration, but in doctrine; in other words, it is infallible, through divine endowment.

3 "The primacy of the visible head of the Church is of a divine institution, and was ordained to generate and preserve unity both of faith and of communion, that is, unity internal and external, of which the See of Peter is the centre and the bond.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

4 "Therefore, the Catholic and Roman Church alone has received the name of Catholic.

5 "Whosoever is separated from the one and only Catholic Church, howsoever well he may believe himself to live, by the one sin of separation from the unity of Christ is in the state of wrath."

In this declaration there is no new doctrine, no departure from the teachings and the canons of the early ages of the Christian history. Then, as to-day, visible unity was declared to be an essential attribute of the Church, and the condition of unity was communion with the Head, the successor of Peter. He who was not with Peter, whether layman, priest or bishop, was in schism; the Bishop not in communion with Peter, were he the occupant of the highest Patriarchal or Metropolitan See, as Nestorius of Constantinople, or Dioscorus of Alexandria, was not allowed to sit in Council. Communion with Rome was, always and ever, the condition of unity, the condition of membership in the Church of Christ.

Cardinal Newman ("Apologia," ch. 3) relates his own experience. He had given his heart to the "*Via Media*" theory: the fact of the Monophysite heresy brought him a rude shock. He writes:

"My stronghold was antiquity: now here in the middle of the Fifth Century, I found, as it seemed to me, Christendom of the Sixteenth and the Nineteenth Centuries reflected. I saw my face in the mirror, and I was a Monophysite. The Church of the '*Via Media*' was in the position of the Oriental communions. Of all passages of history, since history has been, who would have thought of going to the sayings and doings of old Eutyches, and to the enormities of the unprincipled Dioscorus, in order to be converted to Rome! . . . It was difficult to make out how the Eutychians, or Monophysites, were heretics, unless Protestants and Anglicans were heretics also; difficult to find argument against the Tridentine Fathers, which did not tell against the Fathers of Chalcedon; difficult to condemn the Popes of the Sixteenth Century, without condemning the Popes of the Fifth."

The Bishop of Rome is the Monarch of the Church, the centre of Christian unity. I have indicated in what sense his authority may be said to be limited—limited by the divine teaching of the Scripture, the unanimous consent of the Christian Fathers, the divine order established in the Church, the dogmatic decrees of Councils and previous Pontiffs;—limited, also, by the natural law of justice and equity. But, it may be objected, if the Pope is the Monarch, the final Arbiter, may he not, in fact, if not by

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

right, alter the meaning of Scripture and of Tradition, override decrees of Councils and of predecessors? Whence safety and protection? My answer is, Take faith from the history of the Church and of the Papacy; take faith from the promises of Christ to the Church and to Peter. When we deal with the Church, we have before us the supernatural, the infallible; we have before us an institution with which Christ abides, even unto the end of time. This we must ever keep in mind, under the penalty of misreading or misjudging Church and Papacy, of being forced into suspicions and hypotheses, justifiable where all is human, altogether out of place where the divine mingles with and controls the human.

The infallible does not cover the human part in the life and the ministrations of Church and Papacy; here alterations are possible; here reforms may be needed. How are reforms to be effected? The Professor writes:

> "This is a question which would be answered differently by different natures at different times. Among the Reformers of the Sixteenth Century, Luther and Melanchthon, Zwingli and Calvin, Cranmer and Knox answered it, under the constraint of adverse circumstances, by reformation outside the Roman Church; Erasmus, Sir Thomas More, Staupitz, Gropper and others, under more favorable circumstances, by reformation within the Church."

Erasmus and More were in the right; Luther and Melanchthon were in the wrong. No one, under whatever pretext, has the right to destroy the unity of the Church, to rend asunder the seamless robe of Christ. Nothing excuses schism. Writing against Novation, whose sin was schism, St. Cyprian says: "Whoever he is, and whatever qualifications he possesses, he is not a Christian who is not in the Church of Christ." Within the fold—there let the contention be, if reason there is for contention; there be counsel given and remonstrance made, beneath the banner of authority, side by side with the leader and commander. Schism—never!

The Reunion of Christendom! It is the prayer, the hope, of all who love Christ and put faith in His mission. But that reunion may become a reality, a centre must be chosen towards which the divided elements may be drawn, around which they may coalesce in enduring unity. What other centre should be thought of, but the one which Christ Himself did provide, which alone possesses

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the innate power to attract and to hold, which alone has for itself the testimony of Scripture and of history?

How great the need of the Papacy in the Christian world is evidenced to-day as, perhaps, never before during its history. Outside the Fold over which the Papacy presides, there are people, there are ministers; but what of the sacred truths, the teaching of which is so imperiously commanded by the Lord—"Teaching all things, whatsoever I have commanded you"? Adolph Harnack speaks for a large section of Protestantism when he reduces Christianity to the "Fatherhood of God." Where something more of the olden doctrines yet remains, how timid often and uncertain is the voice of him who proclaims them! And when, here and there, the earnest and sincere echoes of a conservative pulpit still recall the Incarnation, the Virginal Birth of Christ, the Redemption, the Resurrection, a cruel denial is heard near by, going forth from neighboring pulpits within the same religious communion. The mockery of Christian faith is the boast of so many Churches, separated from Rome, that theirs is a latitudinarianism which cloaks all beliefs and all denials. Nor is there remedy within reach. There is no authority—from the very principles of Protestantism there can be none—to which all must listen, which all must obey. The "Reformation" of the Sixteenth Century refused to hold to the "rock," upon which Christ had built; abandoning it, they built on the sand, and the edifice they raised has crumbled into ruins.

How little time it would take, even within the Roman Fold, to hurl into a similar chaos "people and ministry" were the Papacy to cease or to suspend its teachings, is made evident by the recent rise, even there, of those errors against the faith, which the Encyclical of Modernism in religion has so severely rebuked. The Roman communion is saved from the dogmatic chaos in which Protestant churches are so hopelessly engulfed, because in it the Papacy reigns and teaches.

JOHN IRELAND.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WHEN DIPLOMACY FAILS.

BY BRIGADIER-GENERAL WILLIAM H. CARTER, U.S.A.

NATIONS play unceasingly at diplomacy, but the grim clouds of war loom constantly in the not distant background. Civilization advances by leaps and bounds, but its progress lies often along rough and battle-scarred roads. The wise men of a day and generation, drawing general conclusions from isolated examples, found schools of philosophy whose arguments are rudely shattered by the proofs of experience. The most altruistic conceptions of public virtue are jarred unceremoniously by the frequent appearance of weak links in the human chain, and potent and unalterable principles remain to tease those who mistake all modern ideas for progress.

The fathers who builded our constitutional form of government word by word, and line by line, based upon the history of all previous efforts, may have left much to be desired from the modern point of view; but certain inalienable principles, then as now, admit of no academic argument and remain firm in the face of all subsequent experience. Among these principles are those which acknowledge the necessity of military preparation and of making provision for the common defence, when diplomacy has failed.

Geneva and The Hague may not have fulfilled the dreams of advanced advocates of disarmament and perpetual peace, but such conferences and tribunals have not been in vain. The rapid development of lines of communication and commerce, by land and sea, has carried in its wake an absolute necessity for arbitration of minor grievances.

The opinion of the vast majority of American citizens, as expressed by the votes of their representatives, favors a large navy. We have no commercial marine to protect, for one may

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sail around the world, on the usual routes of travel, without encountering a single American vessel. If it were merely to defend our coasts from attack, that could be safely guaranteed by multiplying the splendid system of submarine and land coast defences. Continued and enthusiastic support of the present naval policy arises from the general belief that the rapidly growing and magnificent fleet of battle-ships and cruisers is the greatest guarantee of peace, maintained with honor. It is easy for a nation to profess high-mindedness; but, in the eternal warfare for commercial supremacy, it is much easier to be good if the consequences of an opposite course are to be feared.

The necessity for the present enormous naval expenditures is one of the results of long and persistent neglect. The condition to which a similar neglect has brought the land forces of the nation is not generally understood; yet, as a matter of fact, a radical change from the constitutional methods of providing against invasion and insurrection has become necessary.

Although the framers of the Constitution were quite agreed that every able-bodied male inhabitant owed his services to the country in its hour of need, yet the utter futility of depending upon hastily summoned militia was the constant and unvaried experience of each trial of that method. This uniform result brought into existence that magnificent type of soldier, the American Volunteer, in all the wars of the last century; and, while his presence in future wars is assumed, it is not provided for in the complete way which should characterize the preparation of a great people for national defence.

Americans are prone to elect their representatives and then leave to their determination all questions except those of local interest. Generally speaking, this is the course of wisdom and accords strictly with the theory of government in a republic; but, in some cases, a wholesome public opinion should openly avow the support of constituents. There are no questions which arouse timidity in the average public man so much as those which affect the army. Many able men have gone down in defeat by giving opponents the opportunity to rant about the threatened liberties of the people. It takes something more than an approving conscience to withstand the misrepresentation and imputation of unworthy motives which so often characterize heated political campaigns. The extravagance which has characterized

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

all past wars, the recognized advantages of preparation and a proper regard for the general welfare, all unite strongly to suggest the propriety of lifting questions concerning the military and naval establishments above the plane of partisan debate. Public opinion has aided materially in doing this for the navy; but all proposals for increasing the efficiency of the military establishment have not only to run the gauntlet of ancient and well-worn arguments, but must run the additional risk of sacrifice because of the inability of any one, without Divine inspiration, to announce a date when American troops shall evacuate all the various islands now garrisoned by the army.

American pluck and luck have carried the nation through several conflicts and always with the same result, an immediate tightening of the purse-strings regarding all expenditures for military preparation. That this unwise policy has met with approval in the past cannot be denied, because there has never been a serious public opinion against it. It is a question whether the existing apathy would not disappear if the public once became aware of the real situation.

It is a wise business safeguard to take account of stock occasionally, and examine into current methods to determine if an establishment is on a proper basis as compared with competitors. These same principles apply forcefully to military preparation.

It is a fact, too obvious to require argument, that nearly every proposition looking to the inauguration of a military peace establishment capable of rapid expansion to meet the early emergencies of war, that has been submitted to Congress, has been based on the supposition of what would probably obtain favorable action of Congress, rather than on the conviction of what was really necessary. It is a common belief that any department of the government service can secure legislation needed to improve its efficiency whenever the matter at issue is presented to Congress without disagreement and contention among those who are engaged in the national service in that department. Herein lies the serious difficulty of preparing the nation in peace for the duties of war. A study of past efforts at legislation to that end must produce the conviction, in any unprejudiced citizen, not only that the conceptions of what is desirable are widely divergent in the Army and National Guard, but that, even within

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Army, opinion is naturally colored by the interests of particular corps or branches of the service, and not infrequently by personal interests.

After nearly a hundred years of effort, the rehabilitation of the militia laws was secured from Congress, but it took the shape of a jumble of compromises unsatisfactory as a whole to any of those who had long contended for revision. The main object of the new law, which was approved January 21st, 1903, was to recognize the active military organizations, or National Guard, of the States, and to encourage them with appropriations sufficient to render them immediately effective upon a declaration of war.

One section of the act as originally drawn embodied a principle which the War Department authorities were especially anxious to recognize as a part of the military system. That section provided for the organization in peace of a body of volunteers composed of men with previous experience in the Regular Army and the National Guard, to be officered by men holding appointments from the General Government instead of from the Governors of States. The act, as finally passed, was so emasculated that, while provision was made for the officers, all reference to the *men* who should compose the organizations was stricken out. The opposition was from two sources—from those members of the State troops who believed that a proper recognition of their organization would be imperilled by the organization of Veteran Volunteers, and from public men who did not wish any departure from the practice of having all volunteers State organizations, with officers appointed by the Governors.

The question which seriously concerns the American public is not whether this or that paragraph of any law is defective, but, in general, whether the Army and the organized Militia can be depended upon to meet the first requirements of sudden war. To solve this question properly requires the consideration of more details than can be discussed here; but a general statement of conditions may make the situation comprehensible.

More than half a century ago, facetious writers had made the muster days of the old-time militia a subject of constant jest, for the militia called out in nearly all our early wars seldom did honor to itself or to the country. War is an expensive school, both in national treasure and national prestige, and that potent

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fact has caused unceasing efforts toward the development and legal recognition of the National Guard of the several States.

It was strange, indeed, that some of the sticklers for the letter of the Constitution had not long ago questioned the course of some of the States which had organized divisions and brigades of troops, with staff establishments and naval contingents. The opportunity for political advantage from this source has now passed, for the existing law recognizes the National Guard as the Organized Militia, in contradistinction to the militia provided by the Constitution. This action was due to the National Guard, which comprises many old organizations with excellent service records, and whose modern work takes them out of the "militia" class, which is composed of all able-bodied citizens between the ages of eighteen and forty-five.

It is not intended to discuss the efficiency, either as to numbers or training, of any State organizations, but to consider from a broad view-point whether the existing laws will furnish a weapon which may be depended upon or merely a broken reed, when the moment shall have arrived for the diplomats to make their departing bow and for battle-ships and armies to enter upon the stage.

While certain principles of the art of war remain unchanged from generation to generation, the material used by modern armies has become extremely complicated, so that we require many highly trained technical corps, in order that we may not lose any of the advantage which may be derived from the scientific application of modern inventions to the complex machinery of a great army.

Modern wars do not allow much time for preparation before the first blow is struck, and it is the first battle which counts most when the appeal to arms has been made. The prestige of a proud nation may be sadly lowered by lack of foresight and preparedness, and patriotism and material interest alike suggest the propriety of giving the highest moral support to those who undertake to fit the nation in time of peace for the shocking realities of war.

In considering the subject of military preparedness in America, everything has to be worked out as an original proposition. Great Britain is the only country with which any comparison of results may be made, because in that country, as in our own,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

military service is voluntary. American observers of European manœuvres are apt to forget that the arrival of the annual drafts of recruits, available for instruction in large groups on the stroke of the clock, involves a vastly different proposition from that which is presented by the interrupted and uncertain flow of individual enlistments in England and America.

The theory on which the strength of the Regular Army has always been fixed in America is that the smallest possible force, consistent with the actual requirements of immediate necessities, shall be maintained in the highest state of efficiency. So far as their efficiency and fighting capacity are concerned, the regular troops have always justified their being; but in the effort of Congress to fix the lowest possible peace strength, the limit of safety has been passed many times.

The existing organization of the Regular Army is far below the actual needs of the nation, but it was all that could be obtained six years ago when the Philippine or Colonial policy was an acute political factor. Disregarding the Coast Artillery, the strength of whose organizations depends upon the number of guns authorized for permanent harbor defence, it is found that there are fifteen regiments of cavalry, thirty regiments of infantry and six recently authorized regiments of field-artillery, of which some of the batteries are still in process of organization. Of the forty-five cavalry and infantry regiments, six of the former and fifteen of the latter are serving overseas at island stations.

At the present time, enlistments in the Regular Army are limited to three years, so that it is necessary to relieve the regiments in the distant Philippines every two years. This is not only enormously expensive; but, owing to the fact that one-half the infantry is absent all the time and the other half is in an habitual state of reorganization and recuperation, the maximum of efficiency cannot be maintained. The cavalry furnishes less than half its numbers for service beyond the seas; but, owing to the fact that the outgoing regiments are obliged to leave behind large detachments to care for the horses during the change of stations, efficiency is seriously interfered with. So that, as a matter of fact, there are available at home stations, for insurrection or invasion, ten less regiments of infantry and one less regiment of cavalry than were considered necessary prior to 1898, when the army had been reduced to a lower strength

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

than it represented at any time since the Civil War. With this state of affairs it is incumbent upon thoughtful men to take account of stock and see whither the country is drifting.

The act of January 21st, 1903, divides the militia into two classes—the Organized Militia or National Guard and the "Reserve Militia." The militia is defined to "consist of every able-bodied male citizen of the respective States, Territories and the District of Columbia, and every able-bodied male of foreign birth who has declared his intention to become a citizen, who is more than eighteen and less than forty-five years of age."

Excluding for the moment all reference to the National Guard, or Organized Militia, let us consider the great body of citizens classed as available for reserve militia duty. It is inconceivable that a general call would ever be necessary for all the able-bodied men in the country whose population numbers about eighty millions of people. Since, then, there is to be no general call, who is to determine the manner of selecting those who are to compose the quota for a call demanding one, two or five hundred thousand men? For this there is no machinery provided, beyond the authority of the President to make the call for any portion of the militia which he may deem necessary to meet a particular emergency, and to subject any officer or enlisted man called forth to trial by court martial if he fails to report for muster, the court to be composed only of militia officers.

The existing and more recent law especially provides that "all persons who are exempted by the laws of the respective States or Territories shall be exempted from militia duty, without regard to age." As a matter of fact, therefore, each State may determine for itself what citizens shall share in repelling invasion, although its quota under the President's call will be apportioned according to representative population.

The law makes no distinction between the National Guard and the Reserve Militia in restricting service to a period not exceeding nine months, and for the purposes only of repelling invasion or suppressing rebellion against the authority of the United States. It is a well-recognized principle that the easiest way to prevent invasion and save an enormous distribution of force along a hostile border is to invade and seek the main army of the enemy. Isolated border combats have little influence in these days of large highly trained armies. The law states that

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the militia, upon being called out, shall be mustered into the service of the United States; but it is a question for the lawyers to determine whether the new law admits of requiring the militia to serve beyond the territorial limits of the United States.

The existing law provides for arming and equipping only the Organized Militia or National Guard. The old militia of pioneer days was valuable for local emergencies mainly from the fact that every man had a rifle and knew how to use it. Modern military rifles are not found in the possession of individuals or families, so that, when the Reserve Militia is called out, it will be necessary for the General Government to arm and equip them.

Without multiplying reasons to show the defects of the reserve militia, it may be broadly stated, as a military proposition, that it is less to be relied upon than the militia of the Revolution and 1812. It is not even a broken reed—it is no reed at all, because it is absolutely untrained and without equipment or experience with firearms.

Under present conditions, the only organizations available for serious emergencies are those of the Regular Army and the National Guard or Organized Militia. These must constitute the first line, if existing laws obtain, until the provisions for raising Volunteers may be made effective.

The existing law, under which an army is provided for war purposes, was passed on April 22d, 1898, during a period of great excitement incident to a declaration of war with Spain. This law provides "that the organized and active land forces of the United States shall consist of the Army of the United States and of the Militia of the several States when called into the service of the United States." The act then defines the army, in time of war, as composed of the Regular Army and the Volunteer Army; the latter being maintained only during the existence of war or while war is imminent.

There are some well-meaning people who contend that there should be no wars and that military preparation begets a belligerent spirit. To formulate the incontrovertible but historical facts necessary to explain and disprove the specious arguments of these advocates of peace at any cost would require an expenditure of time and mental effort which might be more profitably devoted to considering facts as we find them.

The militia law of January 21st, 1903, was designed to accom-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

plish, within five years from the date of approval of the act, a reorganization of the militia of the several States, Territories and the District of Columbia, so as to make it conform as far as practicable to the organization, armament and equipment of the Regular Army. To facilitate the organization, a proposed military law or code was outlined by the War Department, and suggested to the several States, with a view to its incorporation into the State codes. Although the five-year period will expire on January 21st, 1908, some of the States have not yet taken the action suggested, notwithstanding a provision of the law that, to participate in the apportionment of the annual appropriation, the organization, armament and discipline of the Organized Militia must conform to that prescribed by the Regular and Volunteer Armies of the United States. The existing law was primarily designed to secure uniformity, and Congress made liberal appropriations to enable the several States to put their organizations on an efficient basis.

After a lapse of five years, the total strength of the Organized Militia of the whole United States is 105,213, which is actually less than it was for many years preceding the passage of the act. At the recent annual inspections of the National Guard by Regular Army officers, about fifteen per cent. of the men were reported absent. Out of a total of 2,179 organizations of all kinds, 1,437 were reported as fully armed, uniformed and equipped for field service at any season of the year. The estimate made by the War Department, based on inspection reports, is that seventy-five per cent. of the members of the Organized Militia would respond to a call for troops to repel invasion. This estimate considerably exceeds the generally accepted experience in the war with Spain, when many of the National Guard organizations volunteered.

With these facts as a basis and past experience as a guide, it may be safely predicted that it will be a practical impossibility to assemble, at any one point in the United States, two completely organized Army Corps of Regulars and Organized Militia. With proper regard for the general defence, in the event of war with any first-class Power, detachments would immediately reduce the strength of these Corps, if ever assembled, below a state of fitness for offensive action.

It is hardly possible to conceive of any war in which less than

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

two hundred and fifty thousand men would be required at the start. All the available men of the Regular Army in the United States, and of the National Guard, would amount to but little more than one-third of that number. The outlook for any material increase in numbers and efficiency of the National Guard is not encouraging. On the contrary, the surprising part is that so many officers and men are willing to devote their time and personal means to building up creditable National Guard organizations in the face of lack of appreciation, general indifference and much actual antagonism. Some of the existing organizations are hardly worthy to be called soldiers, but many others have not only fitted themselves to answer the call of duty in emergencies, but have the framework upon which to rapidly build splendid regiments of Volunteers. This is most creditable to their enthusiasm and patriotism, but it should not prevent a recognition of the fact that the existing system and laws do not meet the needs of State or Nation.

That a remedy is needed there can be no question. The character of the remedy admits of argument; but this should not be unduly prolonged, for conditions are liable to become more acute without warning. It is believed that, with five years of experience of the existing militia law, its most ardent friends will admit that some more radical method is required to bring the organizations of all the States to a proper standard. It is not enough that a few States have well-equipped and trained regiments and even brigades.

Additional legislation is required to produce a body of troops capable of forming the first line and maintaining the prestige of the nation while a Volunteer Army is being organized. An increase of strength of the mobile force of the Regular Army is very necessary; the present force is grievously overworked and wholly inadequate for the duty now imposed upon it.

The only way in which a State can secure an absolutely representative body of troops is by universal service in the Organized Militia. A State law requiring every young man, on coming of age, to serve one year in the Organized Militia, in organizations in which the officers and non-commissioned officers are appointed and not elected, would soon justify itself to all fair-minded men for reasons not far to seek. Rich and poor alike would learn that the Organized Militia knows no class and no creed, but

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

stands for the majesty of the law. Lessons of patriotism, respect for flag and country and a higher regard for citizenship would be but a few of the wholesome advantages of this system, under which there should be no purchasing of substitutes. The knowledge gained by actual service would allay the suspicions, and sometimes animosities, of members of labor-unions. More liberality in supplies and armories, enhanced State pride, improvement in knowledge of firearms and an increased ability to fulfil the highest duty of a citizen of the Republic would be the natural consequences of universal State service. In no other way can the great body of citizens of the present day be made acquainted with modern arms and training, and properly fitted to fulfil their obligation, when called upon, under the provisions of the Constitution, to suppress insurrection or repel invasion.

All this could be attained, without material sacrifice of any business interests, by requiring each young man, during his first year of citizenship, to devote two evenings each week to this duty and ten days to field-instruction in camp. And it need not be all on purely military lines; but allied instruction in the duties of citizenship, in brief informal talks at the armories, would tend to weld together a homogeneous mass of intelligent thinkers and render them more capable, physically and mentally, of serving State and Nation in or out of the ranks. Such a system would prepare the coming generations for the duties of the present Reserve Militia, and those who exhibit an inclination or show special ability in such training should be encouraged to seek further service in the National Guard, which would then be composed only of instructed men or "Veterans."

There will, doubtless, be many who may think this impracticable, because States that have failed to do their duty under existing law may fail under any system of militia development. But the handwriting on the wall is clear to those who pause to read; and, if the existing system does not produce more practical results, then it will be clearly the duty of Congress to provide for the organization of a National Volunteer Reserve, of generous proportions, entirely distinct from the Organized or Reserve Militia, to be available for service within or without the territorial limits of the United States whenever war is declared or reasonably imminent.

WILLIAM H. CARTER.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WHY MANUFACTURERS WANT TARIFF REVISION.

BY H. E. MILES, CHAIRMAN OF THE TARIFF COMMITTEE OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MANUFACTURERS.

IN a recent issue of THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW, a contributor observes:

"No feature of the President's policies is more widely misunderstood than his attitude on the tariff. He has long believed that the time has arrived when a revision of the Dingley Tariff Act is advisable. On a number of occasions he has summoned the leaders of his party and sought to impress on them the advisability of tariff readjustment, only to learn that the determined opposition of Speaker Cannon and his associates in the House constituted an insuperable obstacle."

The assurance of the President's interest in the subject is gratifying to that great body of Americans who feel that the time has come when tariff revision is as inevitable as it is desirable. It is this conviction which has brought into existence the Tariff Committee of the National Association of Manufacturers.

It is undeniable, however, that, keen as is the interest in their investigations and propaganda, understanding of and sympathy with their aims have been far from universal. This partial misunderstanding has arisen, probably, from the apprehension that what the Committee is working for is tariff revision, without much reference to the sort of revision. This is very far from being the case; indeed, it is diametrically opposed to the ideas and ambitions of this Committee.

It may be of interest to those who are thinking *pro* and *con* upon this subject to know that we stand firmly opposed to such tariff revision as the country is inevitably going to have if the general interest is not at once safeguarded by sincere protectionists. It is as protectionists that we are working. What we

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

desire—what we feel confident that we shall eventually obtain—is *right* revision. We wish to record ourselves as being protectionists of the old order, standing true to the original principles of that party of which we are the lineal and loyal descendants. As such, we wish to see American industries protected; but we maintain that the present tariff does not "protect," but that it prohibits and defrauds.

We make small objection to the three hundred million dollars of tariff revenue that went last year into the Government Treasury, but we make very great objection to the five hundred million dollars or more that went into the pockets of the favored few, who collected the revenue for their personal and private gain, with the connivance and approval of Congress, on products made within the country. We are protectionists—believing, however, that excessive and ill-considered protection breeds irresponsibility and inculcates commercial immorality.

Much importance is attached to the "principle" of a protective tariff. We stand for principle, definitely, persistently and consistently. What, indeed, is the fundamental tariff principle? On what is it based? Why, for example, is the tariff on steel bars $10.00 per ton? Why is it not $100.00 or $1.00? Is there any inherent "principle" involved? If so, of what does it consist?

A leading member of the National Association of Manufacturers once said, in reply to my question as to what constituted the underlying principle in the making of tariff schedules, that he was not aware that any such thing as "principle" existed in connection with the tariff. "Tariff," he said, "is determined by the resistance of factions."

The one underlying principle which alone justifies protection is that the schedule shall be such as, all things considered, amply covers the difference between the cost of production in this country and the cost of production abroad, thereby maintaining our high wage scale and standard of living. President Roosevelt and Secretary Taft have so stated it. We know of no other. Has this principle ever been applied, practically, by the so-called tariff legislators in Washington? Nowhere that we can find. On the other hand, there is indubitable proof that most schedules are made in utter disregard of any such principle, and that they have no reference to the difference in cost, however liberally fig-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ured. In many cases they increase this difference between the cost of manufacture at home and that abroad from five to a thousand times. This is according to the statements of the manufacturers themselves.

It is all very well to imagine that to be a Stand-patter is to wear the uniform of loyalty. The little colloquial name appears to imply an inherent fealty. But to what does the wearer of this appellation stand pat? If it is to a concealment of the truth, to commercial chicanery, to legitimate ignorance and perversity, is it a thing to bring credit to himself or to his party? Those stand-pat Congressmen who stood pat for bad meat, for opium in the soothing-syrup and for license for the railroads, may stand pat for the Dingley Tariff; but the Republican who wishes to honor his party and justify himself to his conscience will not do so. A great Republican said not long since that his party could be hurt only by a suppression of the truth, and that "the political leaders who rely wholly upon past greatness, and who try to postpone the consideration of present problems, will deservedly meet defeat at the hands of the American people."

Now, the Committee under discussion has two firmly fixed ambitions: first, to face the great problem of the tariff and save a principle by the consistent use and not the abuse of it; and, second, to think nationally and not sectionally, and in so doing to take thought of the future as well as of the present.

WHAT ARE THE PROBLEMS OFFERED BY THE TARIFF?

They are very numerous, and it is a mistake to suppose that they are all of a material nature. To leave considerations of public morals for the present, however, let us briefly examine the problem offered by the Standard Oil. It is said that this trust, the greatest in the world, is not a creature of the tariff, but that oil is on the free list. It is true that the Dingley Bill places forty-two kinds of oil on the free list, but it provides that, if there be imported into the United States crude petroleum or the products of crude petroleum produced in any country which imposes a duty on petroleum products exported from the United States, there shall in such cases be levied a duty equal to the duty imposed by the country importing.

Now, the only country that is able to ship petroleum and its products into this country, in any considerable measure, is Rus-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sia, which levies a duty on crude petroleum and its products varying from 100 to 200 per cent. The Standard Oil Company, through one of its principal officers, sought to get protection by direct enactment. This was refused. Amenable as Congress is toward trusts and autocratic corporations, it refused to bulwark the Standard Oil with "protection"; but it contrived unostentatiously to insert this proviso, which gives the Oil Trust from three to five times what it would have been happy to get openly. The result is that Americans pay from thirty-seven to sixty per cent. per gallon more for oil than do the Europeans. Were we to try to import oil, we would find it safeguarded by a tax of 150 per cent., or thereabouts. And, meantime, we pay whatever the Standard Oil Company chooses to demand. No "principle" is apparent. There is only caprice—the caprice of a trust, which is embarrassed to know how to spend its money.

There are dozens of trusts profiting in a similar manner by means of the Dingley Tariff. The entire cost of converting beets into sugar, for instance, "including the cost of the beets and all other material used in the operation, *together with the cost of all labor involved,*" is only 46½ per cent. of the value of the sugar (Census 1900, vol. 6, part 2, 6, 495.) The average wholesale price in Europe in 1905 was 2.65 cents. In New York it was 5.26 cents, more than double. These trusts hold at a disadvantage the very people who offered them protection. They punish the generosity of their countrymen with extortion, and demand of them a price which they cannot get in any other country in the world.

To illustrate precisely what is meant, let us take the borax trust. The chief deposits of borax in the world are in California; they are the most productive and the most easily worked. The Wilson Tariff had reduced the duty on borax to two cents, and the promoters of the Dingley Bill were of a mind to let it so remain. But a Senator from Nevada was, so to speak, one of the assets of the Pacific Coast Borax Company. He appeared before the tariff-makers with a significant question. "How about borax?" he asked. "Borax?" said the compliant legislators. "Why, to be sure! How negligent of us! What can we do for borax?" The precise reply of the Senator is not known; but it is significant that American borax can be bought abroad for two and one-half cents a pound, and that in American

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

stores it must be purchased, at retail, at the rate of seven and one-half cents per pound.

Mr. Franklin Pierce, commenting on this, says: "Everything in a trust which is subject to censure is displayed to the best advantage by this combination—increased prices, restricted production, lower prices to foreigners than to Americans, and false and hypocritical pleas that free borax would destroy the borax industry."

I refrain from mentioning by name another very great industry covering a prime necessity of life, which is bitterly opposed to our efforts. Its output in a single State is two hundred millions of dollars. The wage cost in its factories is 25 per cent. of the value of the product. If we include the wage cost of the raw material, it is possibly 40 to 45 per cent. The tariff is from 75 to 135 per cent. Some of the mills are declaring cash dividends of 35 to 45 per cent. The duty on the poor man's requirements is decidedly in excess of that on the rich man's.

This duty, like that on the Standard Oil, is indirect and little known to the Congressmen who voted for it. A single example will illustrate. Congress acted on misinformation to the effect that there is one and one-half pounds of waste for a pound of product. The experts of the Government have determined, by such methods as a Tariff Commission would employ, that there is fifty-two one-hundredths of one pound of such waste. The tariff allows, therefore, three times the proper amount for wastage and creates an enormous discrepancy. The files of the Treasury Department are filled with similar proofs on many schedules. These proofs were made public, but disingenuous beneficiaries later succeeded in having them kept secret on the ground that publicity "would hurt our business."

The cutlery schedules present most vivid inconsistencies:

Value per doz.	Rate of duty per doz.	Per cent. *Ad valo rem* equivalent
3*b* $1.00	$ .60 plus $ .40 or $1.00	100
c 1.25	.60 " .50 or 1.10	88
4*a* 1.50	1.20 " .60 or 1.80	120
b 2.00	1.20 " .80 or 2.00	100
c 3.00	1.20 " 1.20 or 2.40	80
5*a* 3.50	3.00 " 1.40 or 4.40	146 2/3
b 4.00	3.00 " 1.60 or 4.60	115
c 5.00	3.00 " 2.00 or 5.00	100

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A single article under 4*a* costs 2 cents more than one under 3*c*, but when the duty is paid it costs 8 cents more. A single article under 5*a* costs 4 cents more than one under 4*c*, but, duty paid, it costs 20 cents more.

As will be seen from these illustrations, the duty varies all the way from 80 to 146 per cent. Without any discussion as to whether such enormously high rates of duty are justified, it is self-evident that justification cannot be produced for the irregular fluctuation of the rates, nor for the decline of duty within each class as the value of the article increases. Competent authorities assert that the articles are made in this country as advantageously as abroad, except for the wage cost, which would raise no such difference.

This method of taxation, this graft masquerading as protection, has the effect of extorting from every man and woman a sum of money which belongs by right to the purchaser. Nothing but the unprecedented prosperity of the nation has made it possible for the people to submit, without acute consciousness and extreme financial discomfiture, to this situation. Nothing but the fact of its skilful indirection has kept the people from rising in protest, and sweeping from power the representatives who have made this possible. But this excessive tax is indirect—subtly so. The duties are mysteriously incorporated in the price. The added price adds not a cent to the value, not a mill to the Government, but forever swells the total of the profits of the manufacturers.

In pleasing contrast with a few industries which are doing their utmost to continue the present schedules, and to provide that when we have another Revision it shall be equally unreasonable and unfair, is the position of the great steel manufacturers. Their schedules exceed the total wage cost, although steel is made in this country as cheaply as anywhere in the world. Their cost figures are so low as to tax the credulity of those not informed.

It is little known that the so-called Aldrich Committee, being the committee of the Senate, which worked for months in preparation of a so-called Senate Bill, declared for duties very much less than those finally adopted in the Dingley Bill, so that the best judgment, at that time, of the Senators, who are said now to be the principal upholders of the present Bill, was decidedly against the final enactment. The Senate Bill rated sugars, for instance, one and sixteen one-hundredths of one cent per pound.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Dingley Bill rates it one and ninety-five one-hundredths of one cent per pound, or sixty-eight per cent. higher. Sugar-cane, rated in the Senate Bill at ten per cent. *ad valorem,* enjoys in the Dingley Bill twenty per cent., an increase of one hundred per cent.

I note another curious instance of tariff-making. President McKinley, then chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, in preparing the McKinley Bill, called in the head of one of the great industries of the country. Congressmen would have us think that they are all-wise on the tariff and they speak of President McKinley as wisest of all. President McKinley said, however, to this gentleman, "I really do not know anything about your schedule, and I must trust you to make it fair." After much care, schedules were submitted to Mr. McKinley and by him recommended to the Ways and Means Committee. The manufacturers put upon the Free List certain products which they were selling to good advantage in Germany and Belgium, the home of foreign competition; but when the Bill was passed, these goods appeared at 60 per cent. *ad valorem,* and the rest of the schedules were so distorted and unreasonable that this gentleman, who has stood at the head of his industry for many years, said that he was never able, and is not able now, to know what rates will be applied on many of the articles.

Upon his elevation to the Presidency, Mr. McKinley said, "Reciprocity Tariff Treaties will be the feature of my administration, and I am confident of success." He was greatly disappointed when the tariff lobby and subservient Congressmen prevented him, the greatest of protectionists, from becoming the greatest of honest and right revisionists.

Our country owes to Secretary of State Root a greater debt than it knows. A most unhappy chapter will some time be written disclosing the utter unfairness with which our customs laws have been applied, the rulings of courts disregarded and foreigners treated otherwise than with that civility and respect which obtains generally among people. Probably nowhere in this country is the utter insincerity, unfairness and incivility of our people in tariff matters so well understood as in the German Consulate in New York. Our people have no conception of the situation. It is a wonder that the foreigner, who finds us personally acceptable, but finds us nationally so uncivil and unreasonable, endures it as

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

well as he does. The reason is mostly in his knowledge that "we know not what we do."

This German Consulate costs Germany as much as does our entire Bureau of Manufactures in Washington. It undoubtedly knows the European and American cost of every manufactured article we consume; and, if it would open its books to the Ways and Means Committee, that committee would learn more in an afternoon than it will learn in a lifetime, except by the method we now advocate.

Secretary Root's action in the recent German Tariff Agreement evidenced the first measure of civility and reasonableness which we have shown foreign nations in decades. Some of the concessions were concessions of right and honor only. Secretary Root was urged to make those concessions a basis of barter and counter-concession. His reply in substance was, "We do not barter in terms of honor."

Contrast with this the mouthpiece of an organization bitterly opposing any sort of tariff reform, who said, recently: "You must not blame me for the work I am doing; I am hired to do it, and I must earn my living."

We are talking against a present-day situation and speaking of it as no longer endurable. It must be noted with much emphasis that in taking this position, we do not reflect unkindly upon those who now enjoy the benefits of excessive schedules. For the most part those who enjoy the schedules are high-minded men, just as are those who suffer from the same schedules. It would be folly and bad judgment in us to reflect upon them. Every game has its rules, every profession its code, every business its methods. Our ultra-protected friends have played the game according to the rules. They have played it more successfully than others. They have done bigger things, and in some cases our nation is the better for the things they have done; but our proposition is that, as the nation grows, morally, intellectually and commercially, the rules of the game must be altered to meet the new and better conditions. Just as there may be small blame to attach to men at this time for past procedure, there is every sort of objection to be raised against the insistent and continued use of outgrown methods to the general present hurt. As a distinguished stand-pat Senator of the United States said, after a lengthy discussion of this subject, "After all, what was right

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ten years ago is not right now." The honor and the manliness of those who enjoy unreasonably high schedules are evidenced delightfully at this time in the measure in which they have signified their willingness to part with their unfair advantage. American business men, after all, are as noble a type of citizen as the world produces, and nobody among them ever wishes to enjoy an unfair advantage once the disadvantage is clearly seen.

Protection is two-edged; the manufacturer must be protected and so must the consumer. This latter fact has been largely overlooked. Combination, in replacing competition, has taken protection away from the consumer. What was right ten years ago is not right to-day. There must be great exactness and care in the making of schedules, that the protection recently taken from the consumer may be again restored.

Briefly and inadequately, this is a statement of the problem of those who would see a sane, honest and sincere tariff revision.

Now as to the method by which they would have this revision made, and the manner in which they would have the interests of American producers and American purchasers safeguarded for the future.

We want a Commission—a perpetual, hard-working Tariff Commission—which will take its honorable place beside the Anthracite Coal Commission and the Interstate Commerce Commission. We are aware of the fact that, under our Constitution, such a Commission can have no power to make schedules (or possibly only slight delegated power, within carefully determined limits), but it should be so authoritative, so well equipped, so fair that, by the very force of its character, it will command the respect of Congress. It will present the facts, and when Congress is once really in possession of the facts, it will act in accordance with them. This Tariff Commission should be as able, as disinterested, as patriotic as wise selection of its members can make it. It should have absolute power to obtain the truth concerning all protected industries. That is to say, it should be empowered to make its findings upon the books of these industries. It would take into consideration the cost of production of a given article, estimate the difference in wages and the variations in standards of living between America and European or Asiatic countries, then sustain a tax for protection when it is needed, but regulate by facts and not by fairy-tales. It would work with the truth

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and not with monopolistic fictions. It would take the place of the cutlery manufacturer in Ohio who himself wrote the cutlery schedule; of the little clique of cotton manufacturers in New England who themselves wrote the cotton schedules; of the Congressman who "represents" only the steel interests and absolutely determines the steel schedules; and of all the grafting interests which, each for itself, through the subserviency of Congress, has fastened its own special tax upon an uninformed public. Not the desires of these interests only, but the facts and truth will then determine, and there must and will be that sane and judicial procedure which controls in the other great affairs of business, and is best seen in the procedure of our courts.

We cannot have this Tariff Commission too soon. We cannot see that revision of the tariff is in any way a matter of the calendar. It is never too soon to bring honesty out of dishonesty —never too soon to prevent the misappropriation of money, to check extravagance, or to substitute a fair for an unfair system. Politicians of both parties promise revision in 1909, after the coming Presidential election. By no possibility can that revision be honest and wise, unless a Tariff Commission of the highest character and competency is established in the coming session of Congress.

It took the German Commission five years to revise successfully and scientifically the German Tariff. Each and every interest was considered, each balanced against the others, and all was done with but a minimum of delay. It provided for reciprocal, with maximum and minimum, rates. And, under the provisions of that tariff, Germany made twelve-year Trade Agreements with foreign nations of the greatest consequence to her people, and has made herself at home in every country on the globe, and easily first in the development of world markets. Let us have a Commission composed of men who will approach our tariff problem in the same spirit, realizing that they have to deal with a great economic science, and that back of the abstract science lie the men who will be affected by their acts.

Eventually, every question resolves itself into one of men. It is men whom the statesman must consider—not only the men with whom he is acquainted, but countless thousands whom he will never see. He has not only to consider how his acts will affect the material status of man, but what influence it will have upon

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

his morals. There is no question but that the cryptic character of our tariff has had a corrupting influence. Incomes such as those enjoyed by many of our tariff-fed trusts cannot be "negotiated" by straightforward means. They are in part the result of a trick—and the trick is played on the people. Many of the people are aware of this, and, as time passes, and their great efforts, their unending industry, produce no results to be compared even very remotely with those of the victorious trusts, they, too, begin to long to be the beneficiaries of some trick. Virtue, so far as they can discover, receives no reward. A sort of contempt attaches to it, indeed; and it follows, almost inevitably, that the honest man comes to look upon his own rectitude as if it were a sort of weakness. He wonders how he can fool the people, what hocus-pocus he can devise that will bring into his pocket a miraculous stream of unearned dollars.

"Our country will never go down in the momentous sweep of battle," says one who has at heart the welfare of this nation, "but it will as surely die from corruption as the moral law pervades the universe, if these conditions continue to exist. In the midst of the whirlwind, now, as in the olden days, is the voice of God; the great soul of the universe is just."

Well, Congress is a part of the universe—and it has a core of justice in it, too. Perhaps it is even a very large and fruitful core, and it may be that, when it understands, it will act upon understanding.

Let us have a Tariff Commission without favor and without fear; a Commission empowered to examine in detail every trust and industry asking for a protective tariff; a Commission which will not seek to confound but to enlighten; a Commission capable of considering national and international needs and ethics. It must, above all, be a Commission that will be able to meet ever-changing conditions. Until a few years ago, our increasing population found an outlet to the West, with land for the asking. The last acre has been taken up, and the sons of those farmers who found free land, and with it made homes and fortunes, lack the opportunities which their fathers enjoyed.

We must make room within our borders for twenty-five million more people, with no more cheap land; and then for another twenty-five million, and then another. We must become an industrial beehive, incomparable in our achievement, and the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

highest ability the nation possesses must be brought to bear upon questions of international trade. The world is our field, in common with other nations. We must possess our share of it.

Let us, therefore, have fair and just reciprocity, moderate and honest protection, genuine and equalizing revision. Moreover, let this revision be made by honest and competent friends of protection, who can be counted upon to safeguard the financial interests of the country—those who require protection and depend upon it, who will ask for what they ought to have, and get it; and confess to what they ought not to have and relinquish it.

Great bankers agree that the half-billion dollars of graft added wilfully to tariff schedules and taken from pockets of the consumers by the few ultra-protected interests is a great strain upon our financial system. The few who get this graft use it in speculation, in the control of vast financial institutions, in the building of princely cities and lavish display. On the whole, they use it wisely, but things will be a thousand times better when these hundreds of millions of dollars are left in the pockets of the consumers to be used by them in the lesser and necessary expenditures of life. The total graft in the Dingley Tariff in the ten years of its existence has amounted to not less than five billion dollars, or one-half the total value of all the railroads in the United States, less their bonded indebtedness. It is a drain upon the many that only a marvellous prosperity has enabled them to endure.

The establishment of a Tariff Commission at the coming session of Congress would take the tariff out of politics, preclude any possible unfavorable agitation, permit us to go about our affairs in the usual manner, and, when at last Revision does come, instead of the "monkeying" and "tinkering" of the past, it will be wholly sane and fair.

H. E. Miles.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A NOTE ON SINN FEIN IN IRELAND.

BY T. M. KETTLE, M.P.

THERE are certain misinterpretations of large events to correct which it would be necessary to call up in review the entire history of the world; no briefer prologue seems capable of restoring proportion and perspective. One felt this, with unpleasant acuteness, on reading Mr. Seumas MacManus's account of Sinn Fein in a recent issue of this REVIEW.* The impression which he gave of the Irish situation is so remote from pedestrian reality, so untrue in both line and atmosphere, and so thoroughly misleading that some attempt should be made to correct it. It must be understood in advance that I write as a member of the Irish Parliamentary Party. This body, according to Mr. McManus, has spent the thirty-five years of its existence in "committing a great crime against the Irish nation." During that time, it has not "wrung from Britain as much of a concession as would pay deck-fare between Kingstown and Holyhead." And at this moment it is "rapidly dissolving" under the criticism of "young Ireland." Further, it is much to be feared that the moral aspirations of Parliamentarianism are of a somewhat more subdued character than those which burn in the breast of Mr. MacManus. The rose-flush of innocence and idealism in his thought—and this is a general trait of literary Sinn Fein—reminds one of nothing so much as that affinity of Goethe's who "carried her nose with as divine a tilt as if there never had been a sin committed in the world." We, Parliamentarians, lay no claim to virtue of that pure radiance. We have the pretension to be realists. We conduct ourselves like men of this world; accept the limitations of our work; recognize the sense in which it is

* "Sinn Fein: Its Genesis and Purpose." By Seumas MacManus. NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW, August 16, 1907.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

true that life begins only where politics ends; in short, we do our unhaloed best with the thing closest to hand. This difference of mental coloring is ingrained, and it will be found to explain many other differences. It is, indeed, the main burden of this "Note." But, before proceeding to details, some apology must be made for the polemical character of the pages that follow. A simple, positive statement would be far more pleasant, but Mr. MacManus has made that impossible. He has, as I hope to show, made his case for Sinn Fein by stealing on its behalf the achievements of every movement in modern Ireland and simply clapping his label on their goods. From our Parliamentary movement he has stolen with both hands. But there is this difference—that, in every other case, he praises while he steals, in ours alone he derides, denounces and misrepresents.

The Sinn Fein movement is a rare example of the weakness of language and the strength of literature. An inspired ambiguity of phrase, an apostolate of plagiarism, and the party was in being! "Sinn Fein," as Mr. McManus says, is the Irish for "Ourselves." In its propagandist use, it simply means "Rely on yourself alone." Now that is an appeal which contains within itself the whole of practical morals. Politics, however, is a matter not of abstract ideas but of concrete proposals. Sinn Fein as a phrase stands for a sound, if not very startling, principle of morals: Sinn Fein as a party in Ireland stands for the proposal to withdraw the Irish Members from Westminster.

The trick has been to suggest that all the recommendations derived from one sense of the words apply to the other. One cannot ask for a better illustration of this than Mr. MacManus's article. Ignoring the lines of division and departmentalization drawn in clear ink over our psychological map, he claims for his little party all modern Ireland, from the ballads to the bacon-factories. Shakespeare could not have "conveyed" with a lordlier hand; nor that Frenchman who said, "Whenever I find an idea of mine in another man's book I simply take it." The Sinn Fein Party, according to his testimony, invented the language-revival. They invented Fenianism. They invented temperance. They invented Sir Horace Plunkett and the co-operative movement. They invented Mr. T. P. Gill and the Department of Agriculture; Catholic Emancipation; forestry; idealism; anti-emigration; the Land Act of 1881, and a whole

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Whitmanesque catalogue of other things. They are "regenerating Ireland not only politically, but also linguistically, industrially, educationally, morally and socially." In all this adverbial advance, the part of the Irish Parliamentary Party has been either hostility or barrenness. And the whole of the new generation, comprising the supporters of all these movements, are in favor of withdrawing the Irish Members of Parliament from Westminster. Such is the testimony of Mr. MacManus. If it were true it would be quite unanswerable, the mind being left merely to speculate on the dark perversity by which the Irish Party contrives to get itself elected. A party returned without opposition, in a country in which it has no supporters, is surely a phenomenon of a hitherto unclassified kind. Miracles of this order do not happen. In point of fact, the testimony is not true, nor reasonably near the truth. Without the least imputation on Mr. MacManus's candor, I am forced to say roundly that, all through his account, he is simply paying himself with words, and trafficking in *double entendre*. Sinn Fein, as a moral principle, may legitimately gather into its net, not merely everything now being well performed in Ireland, but every respectable achievement in the whole fabric of civilization; Sinn Fein, as a political movement, is represented by a loosely organized group, not yet numerous enough to be reckoned as even a section of Nationalist opinion. A few facts as to the verifiable strength of the group will be sufficient to establish this. The "National Council" was formed in the autumn of 1905. Mr. MacManus represents it as a synthesis of all progressive movements then going forward in Ireland, and suggests quite openly that the most eminent men in each of these movements are associated with the "Council." Nothing could be more absurd. Neither Dr. Douglas Hyde nor any of his lieutenants in the Gaelic League has any connection with the Sinn Fein group. On the other hand, their relations with the Irish Party are most friendly; we accept and press home their programme in the matter of Irish teaching in the primary schools, and their pressure combined with ours has, within the last few months, achieved a moderate success in the restoration of certain grants which had been withdrawn. There is hardly a single one of the younger Members of Parliament who is not a member of the Gaelic League: certain of them, such as Mr. Stephen Gwynn and Mr. Boland, are con-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

spicuous workers in it. Any attempt to stampede the Gaelic League into the Sinn Fein camp would be so obviously insane that not even Mr. MacManus has ever proposed it. The industrial movement in its latest wave owes perhaps more to the "Leader" than to any other agency. This paper, with all its blindnesses and bludgeonings, has certainly in this regard "made good." But the "Leader" is so far from supporting Sinn Fein that it pours out on it a weekly torrent of derision. The "Irish Industrial Association," inaugurated by Mr. E. J. Riordan of Cork, is the focus of the campaign on this programme. Mr. Riordan is not a Sinn Feiner; the association is non-political; and its conferences are attended, not merely by Nationalist, but by some Unionist, Members of Parliament. The coöperative movement, in so far as, through the bland impertinences of some of its promoters, it gets any political color, inclines much more to philanthropic Toryism than to revolutionary Nationalism. In short, of all the currents of effort alleged by Mr. MacManus to have come to their confluence in the "National Council," there is not one that is not now flowing in its separate channel.

The real history of the Sinn Fein group is very different. It has been created out of the will and mind of one man, Mr. Arthur Griffith, whose strength is only less conspicuous than his narrowness. Mr. Griffith began some ten years ago as the leader of the "physical force" remnant. Whether that word "remnant" has anything of the saving Arnoldian sense I do not care to say: but Parliamentary Nationalists have always regarded them as the keepers of an ideal, the priests of a mystery, the guardians of a temple that must be conserved. Sovereign independence for Ireland, undoubtedly, makes an appeal to the imagination which is not made by Home Rule. The right of a nation to seek freedom by force of arms must be asserted, though there be no opportunity of putting it into action. Such is the inspiration behind the extremist ideal; no Irishman has ever refused his respect to it; and for that and other reasons there existed a relation of friendliness and tolerance between Mr. Griffith's group and us until the General Election of 1900. Then there was a misunderstanding. It grew less and less bridgable; and in a little while Mr. Griffith found himself committed to bitter hostility to the Parliamentary Party. He groped about for three or four years in a purely negative fashion. Parliamentarianism he had discovered

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to be not only barren, but a compromise of the national dignity; but physical force was so obviously impossible that a party could not be founded upon it. You can shake off an old love in politics only by substituting a new one, and no one can work up a passion for a vacuum. Things went slackly until in 1904 he came upon Hungary, and found that the abstention of the delegates from the Imperial Council under Deak had been one of the best weapons in the struggle with Austria. Forthwith he issued a pamphlet, fervent and fascinating in tone, moving with the ordered sweep of an epic, in which he narrated the "Resurrection of Hungary" and advised Ireland to do likewise. This, in fact, is the most curious thing about the new policy. The present Sinn Fein programme demands that no idea shall be considered unless it has "originated in Ireland, and is instinct with Irish tradition." That is not the genesis of the proposal to withdraw the Irish representation from Westminster. It sprang out of a study, not of Irish, but of Hungarian, conditions, and was known for the first half of its life as the "Hungarian Policy."

The shrewder could not resist a discreet smile at propagandists who, having repatriated, as they said, the National imagination exiled by us to Westminster, forthwith proceeded to station it at Budapesth. Questions began to be asked. Was the analogy set up between the two countries real or only superficial? The deeper the inquiry was pushed, the worse it became for the "Hungarian Policy." There was another nation in Austria, which, in fighting-weight, social fabric, previous mode of agitation and so forth, seemed to present a much closer resemblance to Ireland, namely, Bohemia. Was it not a fact that Bohemia had withdrawn her Members of Parliament in 1867, found the policy fruitless and sent them back in 1879? There had been a direct army tax in Hungary, and Deak had roused his people by inducing them to strike against it, but how was such a weapon to be found in Ireland? The fiscal machinery devised by English Chancellors was much less easily dislocated, for it was enveloped in a casing of indirect taxation. So went the argument and "Hungarianism" was decidedly languishing, when somebody in a sudden gleam of genius renamed it the "Sinn Fein Policy." The simple phrase was worth ten years of organizing effort. It was a speech in itself, and a speech all the more valuable for propagandist purposes because it was soaked in fallacy. The Na-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tional Council was formed. Heresy is always more original in its utterance than orthodoxy. It is also more fervent and fertile in argument; and, thanks to these qualities, Sinn Fein is now definitely established as a subject to be talked about. The change, says Mr. MacManus, was wrought in "grim silence"; and, did one not know him to be a humorist, one could not but laugh. If there is one thing on which we are all agreed, it is the polemical fluency of Sinn Fein. It expounds itself in countless articles and letters not merely in the Irish but in the foreign press, and the only matter in dispute is whether it talks to the point or away from it.

That, then, is the actual genesis of Sinn Fein. As for its present strength, the following facts will help to an estimate. The last Annual Convention of the National Council was held in a small room over a jeweller's shop. It gathers a handful here and there in the provincial towns; whereas, at the great Home Rule Meetings, now being held throughout Ireland, the whole countryside attends, the numbers sometimes running up as high as twenty thousand. But, of course, the real test is the polling-booth. Sinn Fein has never as much as put a candidate in nomination for a Parliamentary constituency, to give the people the opportunity of saying, through the ballot-box, whether they want Members of Parliament or not, or, if they do, whether they want them to work at Westminster. There are some eighty constituencies in Ireland with a safe Nationalist majority, but to not a single one of them has the new policy been submitted. The General Election of 1906 afforded ample opportunity, and since that date there have been several bye-elections. In Kilkenny the sitting member resigned, declaring himself an adherent of Sinn Fein, but he did not contest the seat; and in this, as in every other case, a pledge-bound supporter of the Parliamentary Party was elected. There is but one Sinn Fein Member of Parliament, Mr. C. J. Dolan. Mr. Dolan was elected as a Parliamentarian, but changed over on the introduction of the Irish Council bill. He was called on by resolution of the Party, to which he had pledged himself, to submit his new departure to his constituents; he has so far failed to do this. Then there is the strange case of Sir Thomas Esmonde in Wexford. But the whole situation is summarized in a recent letter from Mr. John E. Redmond to the Waterford Corporation:

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"In Kilkenny and in Wicklow Sinn Fein was not heard of in the recent elections. In South Longford . . . Sinn Fein won't show its face. In Leitrim, in open defiance of the Party Pledge, Sinn Fein in the person of Mr. Dolan has run away from the poll; and in North Wexford the only clear and definite thing which stands out from the strange and perplexing situation is that, if Sir Thomas Esmonde is a Sinn Feiner, which I take leave to doubt, he is quite determined not to submit that issue to the people of Wexford, who, it is manifest, are unanimously opposed to it, as is natural in a community noted as much for its sense as its courage."

There is, it should be said, a Sinn Fein group of eight or nine in the Dublin Corporation, and a member of a District Council here and there, elected for the most part on questions of local and not of National policy. And that is the total achievement of a party which, according to Mr. MacManus, "includes probably three-fourths of the national thinkers of Ireland." A party that conducts its campaign on paper is not likely to touch or trouble our imagination. You push the policy of withdrawal too far when you withdraw not merely from Westminster but also from the ballot-boxes of Ireland.

As to the merits of the Sinn Fein proposal something must, naturally, be said. Generally, it seems to us that the Parliamentary Party stands for realism in politics, and these assailants for ideologism. Representative institutions in any country are full of makeshifts and imperfections. Criticism has grown merry or passionate at their expense, but humanity on the whole accepts the second-best. The Sinn Fein apostle would shudder at such company; but, when he declaims against the costliness, the lack of results, the low intellectual plane of our constitutional "machine," he comes closer to the theorists of Anarchism than he would care to know. In the course of a discussion, it was asked who were the Sinn Fein leaders, and the reply came that it was essentially a movement without leaders. A certain temperament enlisted on our side feels very acutely this atmosphere of disintegration. Some of us fear that Sinn Fein is less a revolt against English rule, than a revolt against the limitation of life in general. What man of average experience will lend himself to the delusion, fat already with so much blood of sacrifice, that Utopia can be brought down into the streets by a simple change of political tactics? But these are, perhaps, mere "metaphysical" considerations. Coming down to the strictly political plane, people

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ask: What is the aim of Sinn Fein? The ideal of all Irish Nationalists is in essence the same, an autonomous Ireland. It is only when we come to the form in which that ideal is to be expressed, or the methods by which it is to be attained, that differences begin. Now, Home Rule is, as a form, a clear idea understood by all the world. What is the political form aimed at in contrast by Sinn Fein? The answer is Babel. An independent Republic; an independent Monarchy; an Austro-Hungarian Union; Grattan's Parliament, and a whole medley of vaguer notions. One is driven to think that the Dublin lady who, mistaking the Irish for French, called it the "*Sans Fin*" policy, the policy without end, spoke with a wisdom deeper than her own. Then, as to its methods: what is difficult to discover is any reality at all behind any of its little patents. I have shown how it runs away from the opportunity of putting its leading scheme of abstention from Westminster to the practical test of the ballot-box. Let us glance at some of its other plans. It derides us for not preventing the over-taxation of Ireland; but none of its supporters has, by refusal to pay taxes, succeeded in reducing the revenue of England by a bare penny. When a group of Parliamentarians, who are organizing for next year a strike against Income Tax, invited the help of Sinn Fein, Mr. John Sweetman, a grazier-capitalist who stands high in their councils, replied that, if he refused to pay the tax, the sheriff would sell his furniture. Revolutionary passion, mitigated by attachment to one's furniture, is not likely to cause England much loss of sleep. A cynical observer could push this contrast between programme and action to the last limit of ridicule. Mr. MacManus is against enlisting, and quite laudably; but no prominent man of his party has made a public campaign against it in Ireland and taken the consequences. The law courts are to be abandoned; but the two most interesting cases we have had for some years had Mr. Griffith and Mr. Edward Martyn, President of the National Council, as their leading figures. Mr. Martyn, who is a bought-out landlord, brought his action to recover membership in the Kildare Street Club, the most exclusive rendezvous of land-owning Unionism and partisan lawyerdom in the country. Sinn Fein desires to withdraw the party from Parliament in order to purge their policy of the Westminster taint; at the same time, Sinn Fein Justices of the Peace, so created under Westminster laws, sit in session to ad-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

minister laws made at Westminster. Sinn Fein Aldermen and Councillors get themselves elected to bodies that would have no existence but for Acts made in London, and made, moreover, through the agency of the Irish Parliamentary Party. And so on. It must not be thought that the average Irishman regards all this with any sort of derision. He rather shrugs his shoulders, and allows himself a salt smile, perceiving that Sinn Fein is hungering after a purity which the nature of things does not permit. For his part, he is a man of many compromises; and he recognizes that, even if the purification be in every other respect complete, Sinn Fein will undergo corruption once more when it sticks on its letter a stamp with the superscription of an English king.

Unhappy as Sinn Fein is in its positive proposals, it is no happier in its criticism. The Irish Party is condemned on the ground both of principle and of results. We compromise the national dignity, it seems, and join in waiving the right to a free Parliament by attending at Westminster. The ample answer to that complaint is that Parnell went to Westminster, and what was good enough for Parnell is good enough for us. When that answer is made before an Irish audience, it brings the argument to an abrupt end. But our agitation, says Mr. MacManus, costs the country too much in proportion to results. The amount is, according to him, about £25,000 a year; it is, in fact, closer to £20,000. With this sum a "party-machine" of approximately eighty members and constituencies has to be kept in being. With us a Member of Parliament receives no salary, no travelling allowance, not even free postage for his official correspondence. At the annual fixing of the register of votes, it is necessary to maintain in every contested constituency a staff of agents to look after National interests. At election-times not a single penny of the cost is borne by the State; the candidates or their parties pay the entire expenses, not merely of their own campaigns, but of the official machinery of the election. Not even the lead-pencil with which the voter marks his ballot is bought by the State. During session, attendance in London at all important divisions is indispensable. Some of us manage this by living in a state of perpetual motion between Kingstown and Holyhead; others by settling in London lodgings for six or seven months of the year. To cover these expenses, in part, a grant of twenty pounds a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

month is made during session. For the rest of the year, no allowance of any kind is paid. In regard to an accepted calumny, it should be added that there is not a single "professional agitator" in the Irish Party. In other words, there is not a single man in it who lives by politics. The picture is incomplete without a further touch. A Party that has no rich man has on the other hand never been even faintly soiled with corruption. We have sought no places and given no bought votes. Mr. Redmond wrote the other day:

> "The Party is made up of men who are far less amenable to British influences and far more independent of British parties than many of their critics—men who, while many of their opponents are seeking place and office for themselves or their friends, have never asked the favor of even a postmastership from this or any other Government—as I can say for myself after nearly twenty-seven years in Parliament."

To maintain the machinery of this Party, we spend annually a sum, approximately, equal to the salary of the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland. It represents a contribution per head of our population of about a penny a year. On the credit side, somebody has been amusing himself lately by estimating the sum total of grants, loans and reductions of rent obtained by our agitation; he fixes the figure at £200,000,000. The penny a head seems on the whole to have been well invested.

But this is not the way things strike people in Ireland. Men, after all, do not think in statistics. It is the visible drama of events, the changed setting of their lives, that impresses them. The Parliamentary Party, says Sinn Fein, has done nothing; and the man of the Irish countryside stands aghast at so much ignorance combined with so much ingratitude. Sinn Fein is at best a *gamin* of the cities; but *he* has lived through the land war and carries in his mind the historical sense and perspective of which Sinn Fein is devoid. He has seen the entire fabric of rural society taken to pieces, and remade under the inspiration of ideas of which thirty years ago the boldest did not dare even to dream. The finance of the Land Acts is bad, admittedly, and atrociously bad; but what does he know about that? What he does know is that, before Mr. Parnell came, he was the chattel of his landlord; he stood three hours in the rain waiting on the agent's good pleasure to accept his rent; if he refused to take his hat off to this or that hanger-on of the "big house," he was liable to evic-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion. To-day, over one-third of Ireland there is no such thing as Landlordism. Where it does exist, it is melting like snow in spring. The feudal serf of a generation ago is the freehold owner of to-day. He has forgotten how to take off his hat. "There is no longer," said an old man the other day, "the great fear on the people." That is how the Irish countryside feels as to the outcome of the Land War, and when Sinn Fein tells them that it is all nothing, the men who saw the beginning and are now seeing the end gasp in amazement. And there is much more than that. The laborers have not been passed over. The Act introduced under Mr. Parnell in 1882 and its successors have created mechanism under which already more than 20,000 rural laborers—in a few years the figure will be about 35,000—have left their old-time hovels and come with their families into neat and solid cottages, with allotments of lands attached. County Government, which a generation ago was the obedient house-dog of Landlordism, is now in the hands of Councils, elected on a widely democratic basis. The new spirit has found its way everywhere like a fresh wind blowing through frowzy streets. And Sinn Fein says it is all nothing!

This is something like an outline of the shape which discussion has taken in Ireland. One can but hope that its details have not wearied the patience of readers who have been kind enough to follow them.

It is pleasant to pass out of the region of polemics and end with a positive word. Nothing that has been said must be interpreted as meaning that the function of the Parliamentary Party in the national life to-day is precisely what it was thirty years ago. That could only be if Ireland were separated from the common and desirable destiny of mankind, which is to grow, and in growing to change. In describing the process one falls back on the comfortable word "evolution." It has gone forward in a minute obedience to Herbert Spencer's formula; it has been a movement from "an indefinite, incoherent homogeneity to a definite, coherent heterogeneity," with suitable accompanying changes. The Irish Party of Mr. Parnell was both wider and narrower than that of Mr. Redmond. It was wider inasmuch as it was the sole national focus of the time, and contained in germ almost every talent and idea that has since come to maturity in Ireland. It was narrower in so far as, having given its whole

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

rich soul to the political movement, it was less keenly aware than we are of the limitations of politics. This is the root of almost every criticism which has since been passed upon it. With that deplorable absence of the historical sense already noticed, a certain group denounces Mr. Parnell's party, because it did the work of its own generation and not that of the next. It failed to create the Gaelic League twenty years before the time of the Gaelic League had come. That must certainly be admitted; but does the censure go home? After all, narrowness is the beginning of wisdom. "*Omnis determinatio est negatio,*" said Spinoza; and a table only succeeds in being a table by declining to be a chair. Had Mr. Parnell's Party not concentrated their strength upon the land and upon the purely political question, they would have simply floundered about in a sea of noble aspirations without reaching any shore. As it was, they laid the foundation of the new Ireland. Everything dates back to their work as to the beginning of a period. The architectural metaphor is, however, too dead to be of any use; and it is ludicrous to say, as Mr. MacManus says, that the "new movement has risen upon the ruins of the so-called Parliamentary movement." One must take an image from living things. The development of Ireland has been like the growth of a great oak. There are more branches now and a mightier shade, but there has been no discontinuity. The warmth of each summer has added its special ring to the trunk; but who planted the acorn? Mr. MacManus and his friends are much too fond of the catastrophic and sensational type of change. What reality presents in Ireland, as in most other countries, is a continual, slight dissolution and reintegration. The large but vague unity of Mr. Parnell's day has given place to what may be called a departmentalization of national effort. You have four or five organizations to-day of national scope, where you had but one twenty years ago. Dr. Douglas Hyde has had an opportunity of explaining in America the origin and aims of the greatest of the new activities—and there are many others,—the Gaelic League. All that has had its lesson, and most of us have learned it. Life is more complex than we once thought it. The nation is vaster than any man or movement. We are all enrolled in different regiments of the same army of civilization, and the duty of each is simply to stick to his colors and to keep marching. There is no such thing

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

as finality of achievement. The question of land tenure having been settled, or partly settled, there stirred into life at once the two problems it had contained as in a shell, the distribution and the use of the land. In addition to non-Governmental agencies working on these matters, there are at present functioning in Ireland three official bodies, the Estates Commissioners, the Congested Districts' Board and the Agricultural Department. These bodies are not perfect in all respects and they have come frequently under the criticism of the Irish Party, but largely under pressure of that criticism these Land Departments have now been fairly assimilated into the national system; and while the two which are occupied with the transfer of land will necessarily bring their own careers to an end by accomplishing their work, the third, the department of agricultural and technical education and economic development, will become, beyond all doubt, the most important arm of progressive administration in a self-governing Ireland. One of the very first acts of a Home Rule Parliament would be to increase enormously both its powers and its resources.

The industrial revival will go forward with rising vigor. Its future depends not, as Mr. MacManus suggests, on the foundation of Sinn Fein or any other Committee, but upon the gradual production of pioneers and *entrepreneurs* by our technical schools. In this widening stream of energy, the Irish Party has its perfectly definite place. Politics is not life, but without politics there is no abundance of life. It is the function of politics not to produce wealth, but to provide such conditions as will liberate the creative powers of the nation, and thereby ensure the production of wealth. It is the duty of a Member of Parliament not to teach the children—he would do it very badly—but to arrange the laws so that they shall be rightly taught by specialized talent. The Irish Party will continue, not weakened but distinctly strengthened by the new currents of thought. The Home Rule idea is like Thebes of the Hundred Gates. Begin where you will in Ireland—land, education, industries—seek to organize advance, and your feet are led inevitably to Home Rule. You can no more have sound nerves with a sick brain than you can have culture and prosperity without the legislative mastership of your own household. Nothing can be done in the proper way, but above all in the proper spirit, while there is a meddle-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

some stranger in the house. That is why Home Rule is going to win. And it does not appear to me that Sinn Fein, in so far as it is in contradiction with present-day Parliamentarianism, will ever succeed in being anything more than a jibe and a reminiscence.

It cannot be too earnestly insisted on that this proposal marks the sole difference of programme between the extreme right and the extreme left wings of Irish Nationalism. Superficial and, it may be, stormy discussions must not be allowed to conceal the fundamental identity of belief and effort. In the struggle for an autonomous Irish Government, Nationalist Ireland displays a firm and even a passionate unity. It is only when one passes to minor questions as to the form in which this ideal is to be embodied, and the tactics by which it is to be won, that any division of opinion appears. So much for the circle of strict politics. But if we cross that, and view the life of the country as a whole, we find that everywhere the fresher minds are being gathered into the sweep of a still wider unity. Ulster is undergoing a rapid revolution. This may be characterized in brief as the Coming of Democracy. The Orange worker is confessedly beginning to fraternize with the Catholic worker, and in their discussion of the future history of labor they are learning to forget the past history of bigotry. Mr. Lindsay Crawford, the leader of this new development in Orange Ulster, is to-day President of the new Independent Orange Order and one of the greatest personal influences in the country. Everywhere there is growing in Ireland a passion for social peace, for prosperity and culture. The great obstacle to the realization of this desire being experimentally discovered to be Dublin Castle, Orange Ulster is growing more impatient of English control and more tolerant of the political programme of its Nationalist fellow countrymen. The South is beginning to understand that the line of prejudice which divides it from the North must be swept away. The North is beginning to understand, for its part, that there is a broad line of national interest separating all Ireland from England, which can in no circumstances be swept away. Decidedly, the word of the hour in Ireland is not Dissension but Unity; and it would be unpardonable if anything that either Mr. MacManus or myself has written should tend to create an opposite impression.

T. M. KETTLE.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

RICHARD MANSFIELD—THE MAN.

BY CLAYTON HAMILTON.

DURING the latter years of his career, Richard Mansfield exercised an almost unrivalled empery over the theatre-going public: he was the one performer they would always flock to see, regardless of the play he chose to give them. No other actor of our times could have achieved a popular success with the panoramic epic of "Peer Gynt": even the author himself did not regard that many-mooded poem as suited for the stage: but, when Mr. Mansfield chose to produce it, the public had to see it, for the simple but sufficient reason that they had to see Mr. Mansfield.

And the reason why they felt that they had to see Mr. Mansfield was not merely that he was one of the ablest actors of his time. The average audience has but very slight appreciation of the finer points of acting; it is won and held more by personality than by histrionic art. And I think that everybody will agree that Mr. Mansfield owed his unprecedented popularity less to his subtle and versatile accomplishment as an actor than to his emphasis as a man. After all, it was his momentous personality that most impressed the public. In saying this, I do not mean to belittle in any way his exquisite and finished art: I wish, rather, to indicate that his art was the expression of an elemental human force which swayed the multitude. The theatre-goer needed only to pay a dollar or two to come into the presence of a mighty and commanding personality; and such an experience is not often to be had in this drifting and transitory world, even upon far less simple terms. The mere appearance of Mr. Mansfield upon the stage was an event. He skilfully impersonated Chevrial or Brummel, Alceste or Cyrano; but what the audience felt was not so much a delicate impersonation as a vivid

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and important human presence, imperial in power, that swayed them to a larger sense of life.

For this reason Mr. Mansfield was, to those who knew him privately, even more impressive off the stage than on. That elemental human power which was his, showed all the more emphatic when he was disencumbered of the trappings and the suits of stage disguises. It has seemed to me, therefore, that many people who felt the impress of his personality only through the medium of his art may wish to know how he appeared in private life. My impressions of him are confined to the last year of his career. Before that I had never met him; but during the summer of 1906 he asked me to settle near his country-seat, in order that I might set to work toward the fulfilment of certain purposes he had in mind for me. For over two months I saw him nearly every day; and one time and another, at different hours of the day and evening, he talked with me in almost every vein.

The most surprising thing about him was the sweep and lightning-dartle of his moods. His mind shifted with unusual vivacity of variation. He alternated moments of sudden and incalculable enthusiasm with moments of apparent dulness and uninterest of mind. In any matter you presented to his notice, he was always more interested, or less interested, than you; he never met you on a dead level of emotion; the thing was, for the moment, all or nothing to him. Sometimes when you talked to him, he would snatch at some suggestion and whirl you aloft on soaring pinions of enthusiasm; and at other times, though you returned to the same subject and presented it in a similar way, he would listen only with deaf ears and with utter lack of interest. You could never be certain that what appealed to him to-day would also appeal to him to-morrow. Often he would kindle in considering some project and sweep all other plans aside; and the next day you would find, to your surprise, that he had shuffled the matter from his mind, and possibly forgotten it entirely. One week he had apparently decided to produce "*L'Ami Fritz*": the next week he had decided not to do so: and it was impossible to predict, on the basis of either decision, whether or not he would eventually perform the play. Meanwhile, his mind was swaying from one side to the other in considering a vaster undertaking. I had gone to the beach early one morning, and was lolling on a bathing-raft. He swam out to me, climbed upon the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

raft, and said: "I am going to do 'Peer Gynt' this fall; did I tell you?" He then asked me to be at hand next morning at a certain hour, so that we might talk over the arrangement of an acting version. At the appointed time next day, he took me for a walk around his garden, chatted of the weather, asked if I thought the wind would freshen for a sail, and then suddenly suggested that we go for a drive. I ventured a hint of Ibsen's poem. He seemed very much surprised. "You didn't really think I was going to do that, did you?" he asked. He then explained to me why the piece could not be produced. A few hours later he telegraphed to New York for the scenery.

The natural way for him to consider any matter of importance was to let his mind dartle all around it, now in this mood, now in that, until at last it swooped to a decision. He was utterly unlogical in all his processes of thought. He never reasoned consecutively. He arrived at his results, apparently, by intuition. In one mood, a certain thing was so, because he felt it was; in a contrary mood, the same thing was not so, because he felt it wasn't: and whether ultimately the thing was so or not, depended on whether the sum-total of the moods in which he considered it flung the greater emphasis on the positive or the negative side. Neither in conversation nor in thought did he march logically, step by step, from premises to conclusions; and he always seemed impatient of other people when, in talking to him, they reasoned with laborious logic. The conclusion was all he cared about. Also, in his own talk, he was extremely sparing of details: his imagination struck home to the heart of the matter; he would incorporate all he had to say in a single luminous sentence, and would then dismiss the subject with a gesture of finality.

The process of his thought was habitually concrete; he never seemed to think abstractly. He expressed himself in images rather than in propositions. On one occasion, when he wished to explain that love scenes in English are necessarily less lyric than love scenes in French and therefore more difficult to act poetically, he said all he had to say in a single concrete sentence: "There's such a difference between '*Ah, que je t'aime!—ah, que je t'adore!*' and, 'You know, Mary, I'm awfully fond of you!'"

His sense of character was entirely concrete: often he expressed his opinion of a person by subtly imitating him. "He does this sort of thing," he would remark, and then would finish

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the sentence with a gesture or an attitude. He could sense a situation best by imagining himself its central figure, and then feeling what, in it, he himself would say and do.

He realized all things by perception rather than by intellection. He was sensitive, instead of being, in the strict sense, intelligent. Images swarmed into his mind helter-skelter; and he leaped from one to another of them without awareness of the gaps of pure abstraction that lay between them. It is a prime evidence of the greatness of his mind that his ultimate decisions, though often without apparent logical foundation, were almost invariably right. Several of his friends tried to convince him, by very logical arguments, that "Peer Gynt" would not prove a popular, as well as an artistic, success. His answer was that he knew it would. After circumstances had proved him right in such a case, he had a way of saying, "I knew it; I knew it all along; I told you that I knew it," which left his friends to wonder why.

In talking with you he gave you only the results of his thinking: the processes of thought by which he had arrived at these results remained always hidden from you. It was therefore very difficult to understand him thoroughly. He never attempted to explain himself; and it is doubtful if he would have been able to even if he had tried. Things were so because he knew they were: why ask for explanation? Also, he never argued with you. You said your say, and he at once accepted or dismissed it: and that was all there was to the matter. And if you ventured, "But, on the other hand, Mr. Mansfield," . . . he would probably suggest some toast and tea, or wonder if the water would be warm for swimming. In any interchange of thought, he talked wonderfully, with sudden illuminative sallies of imagination, so long as he held the matter entirely in his grasp and could dash from certainty to certainty: but if you disagreed with him, and attempted, by argument, to thwart him, he would grow impatient of the whole game and (like the Oriental monarch) overturn the chess-board. The next day, likely enough, his mood had changed; and he would tell *you* what you had tried vainly to tell *him* the day before. Hence, if you wished ultimately to convince him, you had to wait until his mood swung around to yours and then agree with him emphatically. He could not understand you, except when you agreed with him: at other times he heard you with his ears, but not with his mind.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

He had an extraordinary faculty for "taking his own where he found it," as Molière phrased the mental process. Most of what you said meant nothing to him; but the things that meant anything at all meant very much indeed. In a flash he seized and grasped your thought, and in the same flash he made it a part of his own mind. Then he was likely enough to talk it back to you, as if it had been always his and never yours. He did not understand your thought as yours: in order to understand it, he had to absorb it first and make it his. Hence, in matters of thought, he appeared entirely self-sufficient. You never seemed to give him anything: instead of saying, "That's a good idea," he would merely say, "Of course!"

Since he neither argued nor explained, there was an air of finality about his statements. He emphatically told you where he stood: what were you going to do about it? He didn't open subjects: he closed them. He was always swooping to conclusions; and though you still had something in your mind to say, you were deterred by the emphasis of his unspoken "That will do." There was nothing petty in his self-assertion. You felt behind it the full power of his vast and sweeping mind. He was so sure that he was right that he often convinced you by contagion; and you found yourself agreeing with him even when you could not understand the reason why.

His energy of self-assertion gave him an air of dominance which was perhaps his most obvious personal quality. His close professional associates always spoke of him as "The Chief": and I remember how once, when I was taking leave of some other friends in order to keep an appointment with Mr. Mansfield, I unconsciously recalled and spoke the line from "Beau Brummel," "I have a very pressing engagement with His Majesty." Thereafter I often thought of Mr. Mansfield as "His Majesty." In all his ways he was imperial. He commanded always; he never took commands: and the habit of years had given him a certain magnificence of manner, as of one speaking from a throne. No matter how many other people were present, nor how interesting they were as individuals, you were always aware of Mr. Mansfield as the central and commanding figure of the group. He seemed somehow more alive than other people; he was more ardent and intense; he hurled himself at you with a more compelling vigor. You could not get away from the keen impression of his pres-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ence. When he presided at the dinner-table, you found it difficult to look long at anybody else; your eyes would constantly revert to him. I can see him now dancing a Virginia Reel in the great hall of The Grange, with such an eagerness of young enjoyment that he lured your eyes away from all the pretty girls who were fluttering around the room. Because of the imperial sweep and sway of his manner, he gave you constantly the impression of being taller and heavier than he actually was. He was, of course, very stockily built, deep-chested and strong-limbed; but he was a short man, and without grandeur of mere physical appearance. The same body, carried lax, would not have caught your eye; the same face, struck expressionless, would not have interested you. And yet he sustained with such conviction the imperial mood that many men more grandly built in body and more beautiful in face looked unimportant when they stood beside him. Mr. Mansfield somehow made you bow to the superbness of his personality. His unconquerable self-assertion, his habit of dominance, his imperial quality (call it by whatever name you will) was his greatest asset as an actor. When he came upon the stage, he ruled the audience. He exuded power and compelled submissive admiration. There he was before you, flinging at you all the might and ardor of his nature. What were you going to do about it?

An imperial nature can scarcely sustain itself without the element of pride. Mr. Mansfield was very proud; he was also somewhat vain; but he was not (to my mind) self-conceited. And here, in order to avoid misunderstanding, I must state exactly what is meant by the words as they are used in this connection. By self-conceit is meant the self-delusion that arises from an overestimate of one's own powers; by vanity is meant a just estimate of one's own powers accompanied by an enjoyment of the exhibition of them for the purpose of exciting admiration; and by pride is meant the enjoyment for its own sake of a just estimate of one's own powers, because that estimate is high. Mr. Mansfield was not self-conceited. He had a very keen sense of what he could not do, as well as of what he could; and in his work as an artist he very wisely kept within his range. He would never have attempted Hamlet, though the part has allured nearly every other actor of prominence from Shakespeare's day to ours. He did not equally esteem all his own creations.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Beau Brummel was his favorite part, and he very justly thought himself incomparable in it; but I distinctly remember his telling me that his Don Carlos was not a good performance (he even said that in one scene he was "rotten"); and on more than one occasion he stated that the public had overestimated his performance of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde. He was somewhat vain, however: he loved to excite admiration off the stage as well as on. Even in trivial matters, such as games and sports, he always liked you to feel that he had the upper hand. He enjoyed his own incomparable voice, and seemed usually conscious of it when several other people happened to be present. And his pride was very great. I do not hesitate to bear witness, on the evidence of a great many conversations in his glowing hours, that he considered himself not only the greatest actor of his time, but also one of the greatest actors who ever lived. More than once, when his mood was entirely serious, he set himself above Sir Henry Irving and Mme. Sarah Bernhardt; and of many lesser actors who are generally esteemed, he felt, and sometimes expressed, a very low opinion. He liked to compare his weekly receipts with those of other popular performers; and he was proud of the fact that he had made a large fortune by his own unaided efforts. I state these matters because I feel that Mr. Mansfield's pride, and even his vanity, contributed greatly to a certain overwhelming quality in his performances. His pride was built upon a very firm foundation. There was nothing empty in his vaunting self-esteem. He felt so certainly that he was a great actor that he was able to convince his audiences of the fact almost by contagion alone.

I have spoken already of the extraordinary enthusiasm with which he flung himself into the mood of the moment,—an enthusiasm which extinguished even the subconsciousness of all other moods, whether past or future. He was more intense than other people. He was endowed with a superabundance of energy, yearning always to exhaust itself. I suspect that the very arduousness of Peer Gynt as an acting part was one of the main motives that lured him to undertake it at a time when his health was shattered and he felt that he was doomed. Nothing could daunt his tremendous zest and his unreasonable daring. He never did things by halves: what he did at all, he did with all the power that was in him. Often, in his musing moments, he would ex-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

press regret that he could burn the candle only at both ends. He was incapable of rest. Sometimes on a sunny summer morning he would resolve to rest himself by spending all the day in play; and then, through the succeeding hours, we would watch him weary himself in over-arduous attempts to avoid activity of mind. With tiring intensity he would shift from driving to swimming, from swimming to motoring, from motoring to sailing, from sailing to walking, without ever gaining lassitude of body or laxity of mind.

A necessary corollary of his restlessness was an habitual impatience. Whatever he could do at once, he did at once, entirely: and he expected other people to do the same. His motto was "*Maintenant.*" He exalted the present moment always. He never put things off. In the expressive words of the popular song, he wanted what he wanted when he wanted it. Because of an exaggeration of this feeling, he was often unreasonable in the demands he made on those about him. I remember, as a trivial illustration of this trait, how one afternoon upon the beach he asked a friend of his to collect some hermit-crabs for him. The tiny animals were scurrying about, half-buried in the sand beneath tumbled waves of dingy water; they were difficult to discern and hard to seize: but, "Pick them up by handfuls," he commanded, "Pick them up by handfuls," and seemed impatient of the other person's inability to do so. In mental matters, as I have said already, he never explained himself; but he felt things with such intensity that it seldom occurred to him that the person he was dealing with did not feel them at the same moment in the same way. Hence he often expected the other person to act from a motive that lived only in his own mind; and when the other person failed of the expected action, he could not realize the reason why.

For this reason, and for this reason only, he was hard to get along with. No man could have been more difficult to understand; but if you happened to be in his employ, he expected you always to understand him, and always to do at once what he wanted you to do, even though he had not told you what he wanted. He demanded of other people what he was accustomed to demand of himself. In this he was, of course, unreasonable. This is the explanation, doubtless, of the fact that many actors left his company in a huff and afterwards made statements in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the press which were unfair to Mr. Mansfield. To this extent he was inconsiderate of others: he lacked an imaginative awareness of the necessary difference between his own thoughts and feelings and those of the other people he was dealing with. He was too exclusively self-centred to understand entirely that other people had their centre also in themselves instead of in him. But he was by nature kindly, by habit courteous, by disposition generous; and though I often saw him impatient, I never knew him to be angry. He had a nervous temperament, but he did not have a bad temper.

But because he was hard to understand, it was difficult, even for his friends, to come into intimate contact with him. He impressed you emphatically; but he failed somehow, in the deepest sense, to touch you personally. At all moments he interested you; at many moments he fascinated you; but he seldom drew you close to him. He was imperial in his hospitality, his generosity, his kindliness, just as he was imperial in all his other qualities; but he lacked ability to meet you simply, on a common ground of sympathetic understanding. He was more isolated, personally, than any other great man of his time. Other actors did not like him, as a rule; and he seldom associated with them off the stage. Most of his intimates were men in other walks of life,—fellow gentlemen instead of fellow artists. They grew fond of him because they wondered at him. He felt his isolation poignantly. More than once he struck an almost tragic note when he deplored that almost no one understood him. "Millions of people have seen me on the stage," he said once, with that sweep of the right arm from the shoulder and backward flutter of the right hand from the wrist which was his most characteristic gesture; and then his arm dropped to his side as he added, "But how many of them understand all that I have meant and tried to do?"

His humor was a little lacking in geniality. It was large and comprehensive; but it usually inclined to the sardonic. His smile was somewhat marred by a slight sidelong and downward drag of the left corner of the mouth. His wit was sudden, sharp and penetrant: it had the glitter and the stab of steel. He was richly endowed with the gentler emotions; but they were usually overlaid with an imperial reserve. He seldom visibly expressed the tenderness which, none the less, you felt to be inherent in his

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nature. His intimate sensibilities were more receptive than expressive. He was keenly, almost uncomfortably, sensitive to a personal evidence of kindliness toward him from any of his friends. The slightest gift to him would touch him deeply, because he felt intensely the spirit of the giving. Perhaps he showed most humanly with children. He had no reserve with them: with them he did not find it difficult to meet on common ground. And he told them tales, or sang them songs, or led them at their games, with a large and gentle understanding.

But, though his sweeter phases often surprised you unawares, the normal impression that he gave you was that of colossal power, self-enclosed and yearning for expression. You felt that he might have achieved greatness in any art; because, whatever the medium of expression, the thing expressed would have been powerful and energetic. He had written poems and many sorts of prose; in his youth he had painted pictures; he had composed the music for a book of songs; he had shown great skill in singing and in dancing: and yet you felt always in him a certain inexplicable force transcending all expression. Acting was his proper medium of utterance, chiefly because it is the most personal of all the arts. Only through acting could he show you not only what he had to say, but also the man who had to say it.

He was an actor, therefore, by inherent necessity of character, even more than by training and accomplishment. Even in his private life there was about him a constant suggestion of the footlights. He was always playing a part, and playing it wonderfully well, though most of the time he was not conscious of doing so. He was never for a moment insincere; he was always emphatically real: and, in stating that he habitually played a part, I mean merely that he was always giving wonderful expression, through his voice, his carriage, his mobility of face, to the mood that for the moment burned within him. The great public may debate whether Chevrial or Brummel, Richard or Ivan, Cyrano or Peer Gynt was the best of his impersonations; but now that he is gone, his private friends will remember him most poignantly in still a greater character,—the character of host.

CLAYTON HAMILTON.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

INSANITY AND THE NATION.

BY H. ADDINGTON BRUCE.

NOT long ago the United States Census Bureau issued a report which should have provoked instant and wide-spread discussion. Of all the publications giving the results of the twelfth census, there is hardly any of such importance to the American people. For in language the most explicit, and supported by statistics gathered with the scrupulous care that has characterized all the enumerations of the latest census, it reveals the existence of conditions making strongly against the continued prosperity of the United States and its continued progress to headship among the nations.

The reference is to the special report on "Insane and Feeble-minded in Hospitals and Institutions." At first glance, nothing alarming is to be seen in the statement that in 1903 there were in the insane asylums of the country a total of 150,151 inmates. What is this, it may be asked, in a population exceeding 80,000,000? But the matter quickly assumes another aspect when it is observed that in 1890, the year of the preceding census, the insane asylums held only 74,028 unfortunates; and that, ten years earlier, the asylum population was but 40,492. In other words, there has been a progressively more rapid increase in insanity than in population.

Just what the difference is, it is impossible to say. Statistically, it is enormous. Thus, from 1880 to 1890, while the total population increased by about 25 per cent., the asylum population increased by 85 per cent., and from 1890 to 1903 by more than 100 per cent. as against an increase of less than 30 per cent. in the total population. These ratios, it must be said, do not afford an exact measure for the increase in insanity. For one thing, the more humane methods of treatment now in vogue are

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of themselves sufficient to induce an increase in the asylum population.* Friends of the insane, having lost much of the old-time prejudice against asylums, now send the afflicted to institutions instead of keeping them secluded, as was formerly an extensive practice. Formerly, too, the asylum population was largely confined to acute cases, which is very far from being the fact to-day. Again, the patients, being treated better, live longer. Whence in no small measure is attributable the increased provision for the insane. The census of 1890 had to do with only 162 asylums; that of 1903 with 328.

Here, curiously enough, is another gain of more than 100 per cent. As a matter of fact, making all possible allowance for factors tending to exaggerate the actual increase in insanity, there is reason to believe that it is increasing almost as rapidly as the figures above quoted would indicate. It must be remembered that the asylum population does not represent the total insane population. The census of 1890 found no fewer than 32,457 insane who were not inmates of asylums. The census of 1903 made no attempt to enumerate the non-asylum insane, the officials believing that any such attempt was foredoomed to failure for the reason that "the term 'insane' is necessarily vague unless applied to persons whose insanity has been established by experts, since the character or degree of mental unsoundness which constitutes insanity cannot be accurately determined by the layman." It is, therefore, most significant to discover that in 1903 the asylum insane, taken by themselves, outnumbered the asylum and non-asylum insane of 1890 by 43,666. As the census officials suggest, the non-asylum insane of 1903 must have been at least as numerous as the non-asylum insane of 1890—that is to say, must have been from 30,000 to 35,000 units. Which would

* It must be conceded that there still is wide room for improvement in the treatment of the insane. Impressive proof of this is contained in a forthcoming book, advance sheets of which I have been enabled to examine through the kindness of Professor William James. It is the work of a man who became mentally disordered and was confined for two years in sundry private and public institutions in Connecticut. Now, with his reason restored, he has written a detailed account of the treatment he then endured; in a sober, rational, and temperate way making revelations that cannot fail to appeal powerfully and persuasively to the public conscience. His book is one of the most remarkable human documents I have ever seen, and what makes it the more valuable is the fact that it proposes a practicable, constructive programme of reform, looking not only to improvements in asylum methods but to the adoption of measures tending to check the growth of insanity in the United States.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

bring the total insane population of the United States in 1903 well up to the 200,000 mark.

It may readily be conceded that in point of proportion to population the United States is better off than several other countries. In 1903 the ratio of asylum insane in the United States was 186.2 per 100,000 of population, as against 490.9 in Ireland, 363.7 in Scotland, 340.1 in England and Wales, 238.6 in Canada, 224.2 in Switzerland, and 191.6 in Germany. Small comfort, though, is to be derived from this, and less comfort in view of the circumstance that the statistics indicate a tendency on the part of the United States to outstrip even the countries named in the production of lunatics. Some sixty years ago, according to the best figures available, England, Scotland, and Ireland had between them a total of about 25,000 insane; now they have some 160,000, or more than a fivefold increase in six decades. But in the same period the total of insane in the United States has leaped from the neighborhood of 20,000 to at least 180,000, or a ninefold increase. Even allowing for the more rapid increase in the growth of the population of the United States, as compared with the growth of the population of the United Kingdom, it is difficult to escape the conclusion that conditions of life in the United States are peculiarly provocative of insanity.

This conclusion, be it noted, is suggested by the census officials themselves attacking the problem from another standpoint. Their statistical survey of the asylum population showed that of the 140,312 white insane in asylums on December 31st, 1903, 90,297 were natives of the United States, 47,078 were foreign born, and 2,937 were of unknown nativity. This meant that, relatively, the insane were more numerous among the foreign-born whites than among the native born. But, pursuing the subject further and endeavoring to ascertain just what quotas the several nations contributed to the insane population of this country, the investigators made some singular discoveries. They found that the Scandinavian peoples were second only to the Irish in supplying American asylums with inmates. Yet, in point of home insane, the Scandinavians were far more happily situated than the Scotch, English, Canadians, Swiss, Germans, French, or Dutch, to say nothing of the Irish. Again, an amazing "form reversal" was found in the case of the Germans and French, who outdistanced the English as contributors to American insane

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

asylums. Similarly with the Hungarians, whose native ratio was the lowest of all—a scant 14.1 per 100,000 of population—but who outranked the English, Canadians, and several other nationalities in the asylum statistics of the United States. These discrepancies seem to defy explanation. As the authors of the census report aver, they can hardly be due to the fact that some of the foreign nationalities are represented in the United States by the best of their stock and some by the worst. It is, moreover, significant that "insanity is apparently most prevalent in the nationalities who were among the earliest immigrants to this country and contributed the sturdiest of their people." Taking one thing with another, therefore, the census investigators incline to the opinion that "it may be that an explanation of these discrepancies is that conditions of American life are conducive to an increase in insanity."

What makes the prospect for the future more deplorable is the circumstance that an increase in insanity is necessarily accompanied by a still greater increase in those nervous and mental ills which, while they may not culminate in insanity, prevent the individual from fulfilling his whole duty to himself and to society, and thus act as a drain on the national body politic. Then, too, the dread factor of heredity intervenes. Lunatics and neurasthenics cannot beget sound children, and already there are indications that neurasthenia, as well as insanity, has a firm foothold in every section of the country. Let not the reader deceive himself with the thought that this is a generalization incapable of positive proof. Statistical proof, to be sure, we cannot have, for it is impossible to enumerate our neurasthenics as we enumerate our lunatics. But the statement finds its vindication in the life of every American city, town, and hamlet—in the life, even, of the most remote farmhouse. Who among those chancing to read these lines fails to number among his acquaintances some of unstable temperament, of flighty impulse, of unsound mind? On every street, at every corner, we meet the neurasthenics; we meet, too, the lunatics whose madness may perchance pass unrecognized until the morning paper tells its story of violence and sudden death.

It is futile to say, with many an eminent alienist, that this is the price that must be paid for civilization—futile, because a civilization that would sap the vitality of mankind could never

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

hope to prove an enduring fact. Nearer the mark is it to say that this is the price that must be paid for *lack of adaptation to the exigencies of civilization.* And thus we are brought to the *crux* of our argument—namely, that what is needed, in view of the portentous increase in nervous and mental disease throughout the civilized world, and in the United States in especial, is the application of some agency, some force, some principle that will enable the human organism successfully to withstand the added strain that has been put upon it by the demands of modern life. It is not a question of turning back the wheels of progress—it is a question of finding a way to make the wheels of progress run more smoothly.

The sooner our alienists, our neurologists—indeed, our general practitioners of medicine—appreciate this fact, the better for the individual and the race. The discovery that insanity and allied maladies are on the increase is no new thing. It has been remarked for generations, and many have been the radical suggestions looking to prevention. Some of these—as, for example, the prohibition of the marriage of persons with a family history of insanity or alcoholism—would undoubtedly prove more or less ameliorative. But the great defect in all is that they do not take into account the continuance of the *external* conditions making for mental instability—the multiplication of human activities, the growing complexity of the concerns and relations of every-day life—in a word, the increasing severity of the struggle for existence. Now, it is unreasonable to suppose that by legislative enactment or any other process it will be found possible to make the struggle for existence appreciably less severe. On the contrary, as the world grows older, more problems, greater complexities are certain to arise. To this the finger of history points unerringly. Consequently, the thing to do is to take conditions as we find them, admit that the individual must be subjected to an ever-increasing strain, and seek to fit him to carry the added burden.

Can this be done? It cannot if the human mind has reached its utmost development. But of late years certain facts, as yet little understood, have been accumulating to indicate the contrary. These facts, recorded sporadically from time immemorial, but misinterpreted and passing unheeded in the hurly-burly of the workaday world, point to the presence in the human organism

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of faculties transcending those of which man avails himself in his commerce with his fellows. It is only within the past quarter of a century that any systematic attempt has been made to explore and correlate the phenomena indicating the existence of such hidden processes and powers; but already discoveries have been made of immediate practical benefit and prophetic of greater discoveries yet to come. For this the credit belongs to two groups of investigators—the "psychical researchers," who, under the leadership of Henry Sidgwick and F. W. H. Myers, began in the early eighties to probe the marvels of the *seemingly supernormal* in human life, and the "psycho-pathologists," who have devoted themselves to research into the *obviously abnormal* in human life. The credit belongs to both these groups; but for the purposes of our present inquiry it will be necessary to dwell only on the results attained by the psycho-pathologists.

For starting-point, these adventurers into the abnormal took the phenomena of the hypnotic trance. Whence, they asked themselves, came the power that enabled one man to "will" another into a state of unconsciousness; and that enabled that other, while still seemingly oblivious to all about him, to reply intelligently to questions and perform the most startling mental and physical feats, some of them quite impossible to him when in the normal, waking state? Whence, still more, the power that invested hypnosis with a therapeutic efficacy, assisting weary nature to recuperate, to conquer disease, to ward off death? Delving deeper, experimenting ceaselessly, the psycho-pathologist presently began to discern, though at first dimly, that the power lay not with the hypnotist but with the hypnotized—that the hypnotist was, in reality, merely an agent setting in motion some secret principle or faculty lodged within the inert form before him. Now came, for the first time, scientific recognition of the influence of "suggestion" in the realm of matter as well as in the realm of mind.

But how could suggestion suffice to effect all the varied phenomena of hypnotism—the feats of memory, the performance of post-hypnotic commands, the actual cure of disease? This question the psycho-pathologist has not as yet succeeded in answering to his entire satisfaction. In pressing for an answer, however, he has brought to light facts that promise ultimately to revolutionize our conception not only of the mind of man but

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

even of the nature of man. Already the psychical researcher, attacking the same problem from another vantage-point, has made bold to declare that the human self is a much more complex and unstable affair than is generally supposed—that, indeed, the self of which a man is normally conscious is but a self within a larger self, of which he becomes aware only in moments of inspiration, exaltation, or crisis. To this doctrine, with the supernatural implication commonly attaching to it, the psycho-pathologist will not yield a ready assent. But he, too, has been led to insist on the complexity and instability of the self, and, insisting on it, has devised ways and means of rendering the self, if not less complex, at any rate more stable.

Here, so far as concerns the problem of combating the growth of nervous and mental disease, is the point of supreme importance. For some years, though for very few, in Europe and America, and in the teeth of an opposition composed of the most diverse elements — conservatism, prejudice, superstition, and ignorance—the psycho-pathologist has been quietly making practical application of the theories he has evolved from the first basic discovery, or rather appreciation, of the influence of suggestion in the life of man. Of these theories, the most important are the theory of subconscious mental activity, the theory of "dissociation," and the theory of "reassociation." Briefly, the first postulates the existence of subsidiary streams of consciousness flowing unperceived beneath the main stream, the stream of waking thought and action; the second assumes that under some unusual stress—such as overwork, anxiety, profound emotion, a blow, or an illness—there may result such a psychical disturbance that the main stream of consciousness becomes dissociated—part, and in extreme cases all, of it degenerating into a subsidiary stream; the third affirms that through suggestion, scientifically applied, there is always hope of reassociating the main stream of consciousness and thus restoring the victim to perfect equilibrium, provided dissociation have not proceeded so far that cellular destruction has set in. The story of how these theories have been vindicated forms one of the most absorbing chapters in the annals of science, but it would require far too much space to tell it here. Enough to say that, now employing hypnotism, now employing a method known as hypnoidism, and now employing suggestion pure and simple, the psycho-pathologist has succeeded

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in effecting most marvellous cures in a wide category of nervous and mental diseases. Lost "personalities" have been restored, deep-seated delusions have been uprooted, neurasthenics and hystericals have been remade into useful members of society."*

But, it may be objected, this is doing no more than may be done by "orthodox" methods to solve the problem in hand. Granted that, here and there, individuals are rescued by psycho-pathology from the asylum and from the grave, what guarantee have we that psycho-pathology can benefit the race, can infuse a richer vigor into the stock, enabling it to rise superior to the storm and stress of modern civilization? This guarantee we have —that quite apart from its curative achievements, and although still in its infancy, psycho-pathology has demonstrated its ability to draw from the remotest depths of the human consciousness some latent power, and apply this power in such a way as to strengthen the human mind, render it the more receptive, increase its capacities. For the psycho-pathologist does not deal only with hystericals and neurasthenics. His *clientèle* includes mankind in the large—mankind criminal, mankind weak, mankind ignorant, mankind weary. Already he has won his spurs in the domain of mental and moral education. He has taken defective children, and enlarged their powers to an unexpected degree; he has taken vicious boys and girls, and developed them into useful men and women; he has taken the victims of liquor and drugs, and saved them when all else had failed to save them. And always, it cannot be too strongly emphasized, regeneration has come from *within,* not from *without.* The power that strengthens and heals is a power resting not with the psycho-pathologist but with the unfortunates appealing to him for aid. His task is to evoke that power and so direct it that it will do the most good.

This fact it is—not to speak of the corroborative evidence borne by the discoveries of the psychical researchers—which inspires the hope that a way has at last been found to overcome the ravages of insanity and kindred ills. But the process of mental expan-

* For a detailed view of the theories of psycho-pathology and the results that have followed the application of these theories, the reader may advantageously consult the works of Pierre Janet, Boris Sidis and Morton Prince: particularly Janet's "The Mental State of Hystericals" and "The Major Symptoms of Hysteria," Sidis's "The Psychology of Suggestion" and "Multiple Personality" and Prince's "The Dissociation of a Personality."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sion and adaptation, so far as it affects the race, must necessarily be slow. The element of heredity will have to play its part in transmitting to future generations the more robust "characteristics" by which a sound reaction to the environment of civilization is to be secured. The immediate procedure, then, should be to take steps to afford heredity the largest possible field of influence. Which, manifestly, may be done by generous support of the efforts of psycho-pathology, and by educating the great general public to an understanding of what psycho-pathology means and does.

It is gratifying to observe that, few in number as the psycho-pathologists are to-day, they have already won recognition—albeit grudging—in many lands. Especially do they find encouragement in France and Germany. In the United States, on the contrary—and this is the more unfortunate, since nowhere, as we have learned from the census statistics, is there greater need of their services—they have scarcely made their presence felt. But there are hopeful signs. Certainly, no country is more alive—though in a blind, crude, haphazard way—to the potency of suggestion. Witness the phenomenal growth of the Christian Science movement, which has its root in suggestion, and is, in a sense, psycho-pathological. Far more encouraging, however, is the spectacle of one of the foremost of living psycho-pathologists, Professor Pierre Janet, of the College of France, delivering a course of lectures before the faculty and students of the Harvard Medical School. Here, in truth, is proof positive that the old barriers are breaking down, that the physicians of the country are at last awakening to the necessity of acquainting themselves with the principles of the new science. Psycho-pathology will not, as has been feared, degrade the practice of medicine. It will exalt it, giving the practitioner a surer grasp of his subject, truer methods of diagnosis, and wider means of cure. For which reason the first forward step should be the foundation of chairs of psycho-pathology in every medical college in the land. And after this—if possible, contemporaneously with it—the establishment, in the leading cities and towns, of psycho-pathological institutes and laboratories to which patients may resort for treatment, and at which lectures may be delivered instructing the public in methods of personal utilization of the energy hidden in the recesses of the subconscious.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

All this, of course, will cost money, but it will be money well spent, spent to the making of better citizens, of a sturdier race, of a Greater America. It would be vain to hope that the ultimate result will be the utter eradication of nervous and mental disease. In point of fact, the psycho-pathologist confesses himself helpless in the presence of such a disease when the dissociation has proceeded from the functional to the organic stage—that is to say, involves cellular destruction—or when the disease is essentially organic in its nature, being the consequence of profound physiological disturbances. Thus it is with actual insanity. But what proportion of insanity is "actual" remains to be ascertained. Certainly, the psycho-pathologist has even now shown that much supposed insanity is really but a functional derangement and thus susceptible of cure. And, in any event, there is no reason to doubt that, once heredity has had opportunity to operate on a sufficient number of psycho-pathologically strengthened individuals, the racial power of resistance will become such that insanity, with minor mental ills, will markedly decrease.

H. Addington Bruce.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

SOME FUNDAMENTAL MISCONCEPTIONS CONCERNING SOUTH AMERICA.

BY L. S. ROWE, PH.D., LL.D., PROFESSOR OF POLITICAL SCIENCE IN THE UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA.

THE awakening interest in South-American affairs has served to make prominent the confusion of the public mind on certain fundamental questions relating to the present situation and the probable future of political and social institutions in that quarter of the globe. This confusion is due, in large part, to the widely divergent opinions of writers on South America. At first, this conflict of views was received with a certain amused indifference, it being assumed that this unknown land, so rich in adventure, was rapidly becoming the theatre of the romantic novel, displacing to a certain extent the battlements and towers of mediæval Europe. During the last few years, however, our attitude toward South America has undergone a profound change. We are no longer satisfied with the swashbuckler description of revolutions and other armed conflicts, but are demanding unvarnished statements of the actual situation. There is a real national interest that this demand be satisfied, for it is evident that the time is rapidly approaching, if indeed it is not already at hand, when the people of the United States must be prepared to express themselves clearly and unequivocally on certain fundamental questions affecting their relations with the peoples of Latin America.

We must, first of all, abandon all hope of studying South America *en bloc*. There are, of course, certain common traits due to community of racial origin, social tradition and political antecedents. But as soon as we get beyond these fundamental traits it becomes necessary to distinguish carefully between the economic and social growth of the various republics. Each

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

country developed under economic and social conditions peculiar to itself. To-day the countries of South America, when compared with one another, present differences quite as marked as those which distinguish the countries of Europe from one another. In Brazil, we find a federal republic, loosely knit together, but with an administrative organization sufficiently developed to assure stability and security of person and property. The Argentine offers the spectacle of an organized democracy, which has passed through a peaceable social revolution, and in which the political system is gradually adapting itself to the new social conditions. Chile is still, in many respects, a political aristocracy, which is entering upon the first stages of social revolution through the gradual awakening of the laboring classes to consciousness of power.

In order to understand these countries, we must begin with a study of their social organization. The first and most serious mistake into which we have fallen has been in judging the life of these nations by the play of their party politics. The constant shifting of governmental policy, due to the ephemeral character of party combinations, has created an impression of instability which a more careful analysis of the situation fails to justify. In all the countries of South America there exists a wide gap between the political life of the nation on the one hand, and its economic, industrial and social activities on the other.

In Chile, for instance, it would be difficult to imagine a more rapid shifting of governmental policy. Under the parliamentary system, for the maintenance of which the revolution of 1891 was fought, the ministries succeed one another with almost bewildering rapidity. It was even rumored in Santiago that the German government had instructed its diplomatic representative not to report cabinet changes until the new ministry had been in office at least one week. And yet this instability of political life affects the life of the nation to a very limited degree. The great mass of the business community look upon politics as the game of a small group of professionals, a necessary evil, tolerable so long as it does not become too serious an obstacle to progress. Politics is looked upon as a career, which one must either enter as a professional or remain entirely aloof. The idea of civic effort with no end in view other than the public welfare is gradually breaking ground, but it has as yet

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

exerted but little influence upon political life. In Chile, as in the Argentine and Brazil, a small group of young men are beginning to sound a new note, that of the civic obligation of every citizen—an idea new to the political life of South America.

It is important in interpreting South-American conditions to distinguish between two forms of political instability. There is, on the one hand, the type of political instability which finds expression in perpetual revolutions, constituting a constant menace to life and property and an insuperable obstacle to industrial progress. We need not go far to find classic instances; the long series of revolutions in some of the Central-American states is fresh in the mind of every student of Latin-American history. There is, on the other hand, a form of political instability which expresses itself in a constant shifting of political power between different parties or combinations of parties, but which does not affect the fundamental bases of social order. This is the form of instability which exists in Chile and to a certain extent in the Argentine Republic. Ministries succeed one another every few months, but the industrial and social life of the nation follows its normal course unaffected by these changes. It is largely through the confusion of these two types of political instability that we are led to misinterpret the actual situation in the more advanced countries of South America. In spite of all the disadvantages of political instability, a careful study of other phases of national life in South America leads one to the conclusion that there exist in the social and economic life of these countries elements of stability which far outweigh in importance the apparent instability of political conditions, and which offer the best guaranties for the maintenance of order and protection to person and property.

There is probably no other section of the world in which the family organization rests on so solid a basis. It is true that the unmarried woman enjoys relatively little freedom in these countries, and it is equally true that the legal rights of the married women are far more restricted than in the United States. The social status of the unmarried and the limited legal rights of the married woman are apt to mislead the foreigner, unless he undertakes a careful study of the family itself. He will there find a strength of organization and a solidity of structure which cannot be found either in the United States or

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in any European country. The unity of family feeling extends not only through the direct line of descent, but to all the collateral branches. It is within this large family group that the spirit of cooperation finds its most distinct expression; and it is this spirit of mutual helpfulness within the family group which lends stability to the social organization of the South-American countries. Divorce is unknown in the South-American codes; but, even were it recognized, it would be most sparingly used. The public opinion of these countries is so unalterably opposed to the dissolution of the marriage tie that social ostracism would confront those who attempted to avail themselves of this remedy.

It must not be supposed, furthermore, that the legal subordination of the wife means either the elimination or diminution of her influence. Throughout South America the rearing and education of the children are left to the mother to a far greater extent than in Europe or in the United States. In marked contrast with conditions in the United States, there is a lack of companionship between father and children. This gives to the mother a predominant influence in the internal affairs of the family. In fact, on her judgment depend the education of the children and, to a very large degree, the callings which they are to follow.

Another error into which we are apt to fall in our interpretation of South-American conditions is to take the violent play of party politics as an indication of the absence of real patriotism. Because political differences are largely personal differences, there is a general tendency on the part of foreign observers to sum up the situation with the remark so often quoted, "No one cares for anything but his personal interests."

The fundamental error of this idea consists in making universal the point of view of a comparatively small group of politicians. Throughout South America the mass of the people are quite as devoted to their respective countries as in any portion of Europe. They are as conscious of the sacrifices that have been made to secure their present position of independence, and are as determined to allow no outside interference with the normal development of their native or adopted land. It is this fact which makes so objectionable the theories of European and American scientists as to the desirability of "placing turbu-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lent South America under the domination of races who have demonstrated their aptitude for self-government." Propositions of this kind are extremely attractive to the northern mind. They are clothed in scientific language, and have all the appearance of careful scientific deductions. The real reason for their widespread acceptance, however, is to be found in the fact that they flatter that complacent sense of national and racial superiority which is so deeply imbedded in the American mind, and which is largely responsible for the feeling of distrust that still exists in certain sections of South America.

The history of South America abounds with deeds of heroism and self-sacrifice, the memory of which has been a constant spur to national pride and patriotism. To think that these countries regard lightly their past or their future is fundamentally to misconstrue the temper of the people. The strength of national feeling and the consciousness of national purpose are becoming more definitely marked with each decade. The invitation to attend the second Peace Conference at The Hague was but the formal recognition of an accomplished fact—the establishment of a group of sovereign and independent states in the southern hemisphere whose political importance could no longer be ignored. We, in the United States, are but beginning to realize that these nations are no longer the object of our condescending sympathy. For the most part, they are full-fledged states, ready to assume their share of the world's work and destined to exert a powerful influence upon world-politics. To our government their co-operation and support will be invaluable in raising the plane of international relations and in maintaining the higher interests of international peace. This phase of the situation we have hitherto ignored, taking it for granted that while we might be of service to the countries of South America, we could not expect anything in the nature of counter-service.

To this series of misrepresentations of South-American conditions we may add the opinion, so generally expressed by all writers, that individual initiative and enterprise are totally lacking; the government being expected not only to perform its usual functions, but also to assist individuals in undertakings of a purely private character. It is true that this tendency, inherited from Spain, strongly impresses the foreign observer, and it requires some time to detect the changes that are taking

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

place. Amongst the members of the younger generation the example of the United States is exerting a marked influence. In Brazil, in the Argentine and in Chile; the influence of the new spirit is most marked, not only in commercial life, but also in civic and philanthropic effort. The improvement of the educational system, the closer commercial and intellectual contact with the United States, and the example of the large foreign population, have all contributed toward fostering the new movement. Unless the signs of the time are fundamentally misleading, we may confidently look forward to the gradual disappearance of the old Spanish tradition of parentalism, and to the inauguration of a period of individual initiative and enterprise which will set at rest all doubts as to the capacity of the people of Latin America to avail themselves of the rich and varied resources with which this section of the American continent has been endowed.

The views of the people of the United States with reference to South America have been formed in part from newspaper reports, which have until recently been devoted almost exclusively to the details of revolutionary movements, and in part from the highly colored accounts of writers in search of adventure or fascinated by the picturesque. We are now entering upon the transition from fiction or half-truth to reality, a change which will not only give us a clearer appreciation of South-American conditions, but will also pave the way for a closer understanding between the republics of this hemisphere. L. S. Rowe.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

HOW TO ADJUST THE ELECTION LAWS TO MODERN CONDITIONS.

BY JAMES T. CLARK.

STUDENTS of all the current election-reform plans are conscious that, underneath the campaign of the reformers against the politicians, is steadily developing the true democracy. We are too much inclined to think of democracy as a political institution, to be compared and weighed in the balance against monarchical, aristocratic and other forms of government, whereas is is simply the assertion of the equal right of all to enjoy the earth. Ever since science gave society to understand the possibilities of this enjoyment and Voltaire's school taught it to fix its eyes on this world, instead of another, the destiny of democracy has been plain. It is a pity that the means, or machinery, of popular government should lag behind the economic and social realization of it.

That progress to this end should go by currents and counter-currents is inevitable. At present, with all the eagerness of intelligent modern society to work out some adequate scheme of popular control of government, it has got foul of the contrary principle of tyrannical control by a few, represented by political party organization. So dominant has this power become that the majority of American citizens accept it as permanent. All their plans for bettering the results of democracy begin with party. It is no wonder, since party has so firmly intrenched itself in the popular mind and in the law; but if it is in principle opposed to democracy, it is plain that it cannot be the effective instrument of the latter. All the election reforms now agitated, the various forms of the ballot, direct as opposed to primary nominations, and the corrupt-practices legislation, all are the sequels of party domination and assume its continuance. The

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

direct-nomination plan, in theory, seeks to cut out the party primary, but in fact it keeps the party primary alive by giving the party label its same old sway. Whether in large constituencies any true selection of candidates can be made by the direct voting of all, is a question that reason must answer in the negative. Unless something corresponding essentially to the party primary intervenes, the vote, it is evident, must be scattering and inconclusive. Any more diffused influence toward concentrating the vote in a large city—say, by the high reputation of conspicuous citizens—must be easily overborne by a little organization after the machine pattern, using its powerful traditions. That this is the fact, Mr. Luce, the author of the Massachusetts direct-nomination law, himself testifies. He told the writer recently that under this method no more independent candidates are put forward than under the old.

Its exhibition in Boston this year was dismal. Hardly half the registered voters participated in the primaries, and the nominations were confined to the regular candidates of machine factions.

The laudable efforts of the Association to Prevent Corrupt Practices in New York State have resulted only in such a complicated, though thus far ineffective, law that the State Department is at a loss how to interpret it and is at a standstill as to its enforcement.

The ballot of to-day, whose complexity perplexes most of our voters, is but a physical index of the complexity and absurd futility of our election scheme. Is any private business done by such ill-adapted means? Yet we go on reforming the ballot without touching the profound fallacy behind it.

The fact is that something corresponding to the party primary is, in its nature, an essential of democracy in large populations. England's experience under its present low suffrage is almost a demonstration of this. With us the caucus sprang up spontaneously with the growth of our population, beginning with the large constituencies. The Congressional caucus of the beginning of last century, which undertook to converge the choice of the country on Presidential and Vice-Presidential candidates, was the prototype. It scandalized our forefathers. In England, after the Reform Act of 1867, with great extension of the suffrage, this "Yankee invention," as it was scornfully called, appeared

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

full-fledged to meet the problem of vast constituencies. Joseph Chamberlain was the first to appropriate it as the means of controlling mere numerical majorities to which democracy had come. John Stuart Mill, representing the minds in advance of the times on that subject, protested against this machinery devised to swamp individualism by massing individuals. Nevertheless, it is probably true that the caucus has ruled England's political destinies since its adoption in Birmingham in 1868. The whole apparatus of the party system as known among us arose in England in turn. On the death, some eight years ago, of Mr. Thomas Schnadhorst, the London "Times" told the whole history. He had been a sort of Hanna or Croker of the Liberal party; to him Mr. Gladstone frankly attributed the success of his party. The "Times" admitted that the caucus, which the Tories scorned when it was first employed by the Radicals and Liberals, had forced itself upon the Conservatives, until that party had carried it to further lengths than those who introduced it in England. This would seem good evidence of the necessity of the caucus to the system of direct universal voting in large populations, contrary as the idea was to British traditions.

As long as the conditions call for some agency of this kind for the operation of at least a nominal democracy, it will play its real part whether recognized by the law or ignored by it. It is plain that this party primary commands the situation at present and has been the master of our destinies. The people have steadily less and less control of it. After the experience we have had with it, it seems an unavoidable conclusion that the permanent party organization plan is a false democracy.

No wonder the eagerness for political liberty took this first course. That every one should vote for everything seemed the obvious mode of popular government; but this is reducing society, in principle, to a dead level. Not that the grades of men are fixed, but that there is an eternal touchstone of their classification, that is their usefulness to society. In all other relations of life, except government, this element of individual force has play. In business, there is the nicest selection, according to services. Every active member of society comes to be labelled as honest or the contrary, industrious or slothful, close-fisted or open-handed, generous or ignoble, stanch or timid, and so forth, and society uses them accordingly. But our proposition in the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

present form of democracy is that every one should count the same in the important business of selecting our officers. The desirability of some distinction among men in this function will be readily assented to; and it will even be claimed that the party system meets this need. But it cannot be denied that it works to private and to anti-popular ends. The test of a property or educational qualification of the voter is rejected as being too little plastic and only a rough method, like the civil service examination system. Their importance to it as judged by society itself seems to be the only criterion of the fitness of men to have a hand in the direction of government. The whole problem of democracy, then, is how to give that judgment of society free play. It is submitted that the present party system does not effect this.

It needs to be said here that what is known as the party system is really a perversion of the party principle; but it has become a fetish to which we have transferred all our ideas of party, and our minds are so fully in its control that we cannot conceive a change. So, "like boys that swim on bladders," we are not using our powers. We have virtually handed over the whole business of government to party organizers, and turned ourselves to other affairs quite aside from the public thing.

Among all the hopeful projects of reform, there is one which has the distinction of not beginning with party. It is a plan poposed some years ago by a citizen of New York State,* which is virtually a return to the New England Town Meeting idea, with adaptation to new conditions and safeguards against the invasion of machine politics. The plan recommended itself so well to the citizens of the city where it was first put forth that a bill embodying it was put through the Legislature, only to be vetoed by Mr. Flower, who was then Governor. This plan begins by obliterating the politician's map of election districts. In a typical city, it preserves the ward boundaries, but mingles all the voters within those limits without geographical separation. Assuming that within such limits as a ward there is some community of acquaintance and interests, it proposes that a registration of the voters therein shall be made and groups of two hundred, or about that number, selected by lot, the names of voters being chosen from the ward register as those of jurors from a

* The late C. C. P. Clark, M.D., of Oswego.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

panel. These groups, it is proposed, chosen thus by lot, should at once meet and perform the single part of choosing a representative, not necessarily from their own number, but from the ward, to meet with other representatives chosen in the same way by the other groups of the ward. These representatives in each ward form a college of electors, which has the double function of naming ward officers, when met together, and also naming a representative for the ward to a higher college composed of representatives chosen in like manner. This system of compound representation is logically extensible according to the complexity and rising planes of government.

A prime feature of the plan is that the officers thus chosen must take office and continue in it until they are removed by the same representative electors who appointed them. The representative electors are likewise removable by the constituency which chose them. A redivision of the voters into primary groups by lot is to be made periodically.

It is claimed for this system that it employs two principles essential to any true popular government, which the present election system violates: first, an actual conference of citizens limited to a number small enough to permit actual free discussion and the operation of the influence of personality; second, restricting the participation of citizens in the control of government to the scope of their intelligence.

That is, it corrects two lies of our present system—namely, the false assumptions that the voter can express his real choice, and that he is qualified to choose all officers. All the election law today amounts to, aside from the regulation of the party primaries — that is, aside from the party nomination machinery—is that every voter should on a certain day go to the polls and vote for all officers. The rest is regulation by the party system. It provides for no meetings for deliberation, but assumes that a choice of public officers with regard to satisfactory fitness can be had by the impulse of the mass of voters. Of course, the explanation of this is that this simple law is the survival of the early period of our history when society was as simple. But the conditions have changed from the simple to the complex. Yet there has been no adjustment of the fundamental law to the new conditions.

The need of this adjustment tells the whole story of the rise of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

party organization and the machine politician. It has been their occasion and their opportunity. All the Demogorgon mass of party machinery—primary, convention and committee, extending over the whole sphere of government—is the necessary aid and supplement to the utterly inadequate election law. The point, in connection with its effect on our politics and on the development of democracy, is that it has all been supplied by individuals or organizations without authority of, or responsibility to, the people, and that it is controlled more and more for the party organizers' private ends. It is admirably adapted to their purposes. There is reason in their division of the party voting body into small primary units. The whole principle here contended for, of a subdivision of the work of election, is recognized in the politician's plan. It is the plain means for organizing a large mass like, in its formation, to an army. Its other fundamental, as in military discipline, is obedience. The eternal conquest of spoils stimulating its spirit, its organization is vital and vigorous. It is this intrenched power that all movements of citizens outside of party have to cope with and overcome. This established rule, with its permanent organization, fed by the continuous returns of office, sets the measure of the public's effort necessary to take control of the public's affairs.

It is claimed for the plan of popular election briefly sketched above that, by beginning at the bottom and cancelling the politician's map of operations, this unequal contest is put on a more even basis. If, instead of beginning with small local units (election districts), whose voters are commandeered by the district lieutenants as so many counters to be cast up in the sum of the boss, the body of voters within a ward are fluxed and their assortment in primaries is determined by lot, as has been indicated, limiting this mingling to the boundaries of a ward as commonly existing in American cities, it is believed the principle is preserved that those grouped from such a body to meet together shall have neighborhood acquaintance, as far as it exists in modern cities, and local common interests to guide their simple part in the ascending process of selecting the fittest and best men. The base of this theory is "men not measures." For it is held that good measures can only come from good men, and that from them they will come.

We are proud and confident of the virtue of the old New Eng-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

land Town Meeting; but it has still an older title to importance. It was only rediscovered and adopted by our forefathers, for it appeared spontaneously in the early budding of free Teutonic ideas after the Middle Ages. It has appeared likewise at various crises of society, when old institutions were in flux and natural methods asserted themselves. The plan here outlined was resorted to for the assembling of the *tiers état* in the States General at the time of the French Revolution, which became the National Assembly. How admirable its results, let those instructed and patriotic historians, Erckmann and Chatrian, testify.

In "The Story of a Peasant"* will be found the proclamation of the King that called this body together and ordered the manner of its election. The document provides (1) that the voters of each parish and community were to meet at the "Guild Hall" and elect deputies who should constitute "the assembly of the third estate" of the town; (2) that this body should appoint deputies at the rate of "one for every hundred houses," to represent it at the convention of the "principal bailiwick"; which, in turn, (3) was to send a fourth part of its number to "represent it at Paris."

Commenting on that compound system of representation, the authors remark:

> "It will be observed that instead of naming, as we do now, deputies of whom we know nothing . . . we chose, as was sensible, from one's own village. . . . Those persons then selected the most sensible, the most able, the boldest and best educated to sustain our appeals to the King, the princes, the nobles and the bishops. In this fashion we had what was good. Look at what our deputies did in '89, and what these do to-day; then you will see whether it was better to have folks who were chosen because they were known, or men whom you elect because the prefect recommends them to you."

Substitute in the last sentence "politician" for "prefect," *et de te fabula narratur*.

Cromwell's army, when they demanded their right to be heard in Parliament for the part they had played in bringing about the Commonwealth, adopted much the same plan. The testimony of the great founders of the Republic is almost an injunction to us. The Town Meeting, with which Samuel Adams knit up the bone and sinew of a new nation, has well been called "the primordial cell of democracy." John Adams, when our Minister in Eng-

* Vol. I, p. 135, *et seq.*, Beeton's Library Edition.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

land, explained the young nation's strength to her wondering mother by the simple secret, "the town meeting, the school meeting, the church meeting and the meeting of the militia on training-day."

Thomas Jefferson, the most practical as well as the most far-seeing of the prophets of democracy, said:

> "Those wards, called townships in New England, are the vital principle of their government, and have proved themselves the wisest invention ever devised by the wit of man for the perfect exercise of self-government and for its preservation. As Cato then concluded every speech with the words, '*Carthago delenda est,*' so do I every opinion with that injunction, 'Divide the country into wards.'"

That is, divide the voting body into small primary groups.

Virtually the very plan proposed here was left as a legacy by Turgot, that prophet of human rights and liberty, so far ahead of his times that the peaceful revolution which his ideas were beginning to work, and surely must have worked, was made a matter of posthumous centuries by the actual bloody Revolution.

Any such plan of popular elections as that here broached, assuming it is approximately politician-proof, must seem at present almost a counsel of perfection. Especially must this seem so to those who have most acquaintance with what has to be overcome before so radical a substitution could be made for the present hierarchy of politicians. Only those who have worked in season and out of season to gain an inch toward the protection and freedom of the ballot know what the arts and stratagems are that must be encountered. The very law confounds them; the sinister minds of the party legislators have wrought a confusion.

The permanent party idea being imposed on us, the laws, even when ostensibly directed to curbing its absolute rule, have served to perpetuate it. If now anything is undertaken which promises to essentially modify the machine's control, it is a Sisyphean and endless task to revise and amend appropriately the existing statutes, only with the prospect that the particular and vital point will be dropped out of the new legislation in its course through the legislature.

The question then arises whether anything can be hoped from following up this endless and heretofore fruitless negotiation with the politicians, in which hardly anything has been wrested from their main purpose and design. Bold as the proposal is, it is

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a question whether some radical renovation of our election law cannot be *forced* by public sentiment from the politicians, at least enough for an experiment on a small scale of something like pure democracy. The politician is content to lead us on false scents, throwing us now and then a fair-sounding, nominal but unsubstantial concession. These herrings drawn across the trail have thus far led nowhere.

On this point, the history of the effort to try the plan described here is instructive. It proposed a radical change. Nevertheless, when submitted in the public prints in the city where it originated, it was supported by a large majority, if not a substantial unanimity, of the voters. This was testified to by the outgoing and incoming mayors. The bill, incorporating the plan as an amendment to the city charter, went to Albany with a large delegation of the foremost citizens behind it. The local representatives in Senate and Assembly could not refuse to promote it ostensibly, simply as a measure of home rule. Yet how insincere the politicians were was shown by the appeal of the Assemblyman who had the measure ostensibly in charge to the local boss to save him from the pressure for the measure of the thousands of best citizens of both political parties. He wrote he had received just two letters against it. The only response to this unhappy politician was from a handful of notoriously active machine men. But the popular demand was too strong to be denied. The measure passed both houses, but its importance had been measured and the higher powers had decreed its death. Even Tammany aroused itself to suppress this promising project of reform from a distant part of the State. The result was a veto by Governor Flower in a message so inept that it showed neither a knowledge of the measure nor a knowledge of democratic principles. Why should it? They have not been the politicians' study.

JAMES T. CLARK.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

INVESTMENT SECURITIES—III.

BY FINANCIER.

General Mortgage Bonds.—Following their First, Second, Divisional and other Mortgage Bonds, many roads have issued their General Mortgage Bonds. A number of these securities were issued during the business depression of 1890 to 1896, when, as a result of the reckless railroad financing of the decade prior to 1890, many roads were forced into the hands of receivers.

The General Mortgage Bonds were secured by a general or "blanket" mortgage on all the property of the company, the lien being, of course, subject to the first or underlying bonds, many of which were not disturbed by the paring down of securities which the reorganization entailed. Most of the General Mortgage Bonds issued at this time bore four or five per cent. interest; and, as a result of the reorganization, holders of the secondary or junior mortgage bonds bearing six or seven per cent. interest were compelled to take General Mortgage Bonds, in part or in full, in exchange for their securities on which the road had been compelled to default. The result reduced the annual interest charges within the amount which it was anticipated the road could earn. In some instances, it was found possible to issue additional amounts of these General Mortgage Bonds, and with the funds thus obtained to rehabilitate the roads, the physical condition of many of which was deplorable.

Usually, the authorized issue of these General Mortgage Bonds was very large, and their term was made a long one—frequently a hundred years. Only a comparatively small proportion of the total amount authorized was put out at first. A large part of the issue would be reserved to take up or refund the underlying bonds as they matured.

A number of General Mortgage Bonds of some great systems are

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

now secured by a first lien upon important parts of the roads, as some of the First Mortgage Bonds which formerly preceded the General Bonds have matured, and have been paid off with the proceeds of the General Mortgage Bonds which had been reserved for that purpose. The General Bonds have thus become subrogated to the first lien of the bonds retired.

It is also usually provided in the General Mortgages that a certain amount, varying from $1,000,000 to $3,000,000 of bonds, may be issued each year to pay for improvements, the construction of branches, extensions, etc.

A typical issue of this class, although not created as a result of a reorganization, is found in the General Mortgage Gold Bonds of the Chicago, Milwaukee and St. Paul Railway, a part of which bear 3½ per cent. interest and a part 4 per cent. The total amount authorized is $150,000,000, but only $40,000,000 has been issued, the balance being reserved to take up Divisional and Branch Bonds having a prior lien, or to provide funds for improvements, extensions, etc. These bonds are now secured by a first lien on over 1,700 miles of road and are a junior lien on nearly all the balance of the system. The Chicago, Milwaukee and St. Paul General Mortgage Bonds are regarded as thoroughly high-grade securities, not only because they are in part First Mortgage Bonds, but also because the total indebtedness of the Chicago, Milwaukee and St. Paul Railway is very light in comparison with the value of its assets, and because the net earnings of the road are between three and four times the amount required to pay the bond interest.

The Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fé Railway General Mortgage Four-per-cent. Bonds, due in 1995, were authorized in 1895 as a result of the Reorganization Plan which terminated the receivership of the road in that year.

Of the $165,490,500 of bonds authorized, $146,634,500 are now outstanding, and they are secured by a first mortgage on more than 5,000 miles of road. Since the reorganization, the Atchison has developed into a road of great importance, and its General Mortgage Bonds rank well among investment securities. The net earnings are not only sufficient to meet the interest charges, but they exceed the amount required for this purpose by an ample margin.

The Erie General Mortgage Four-per-cent. Bonds of 1996 are

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

less conservative in character than the Atchison or St. Paul bonds above mentioned. They are secured by a first mortgage on only a few miles, while on important parts of the road they are preceded by no less than six prior liens.

Consolidated and Unified Mortgage Bonds.—Bonds issued under Consolidated and Unified Mortgages are very similar to the General Mortgage Bonds. Usually, the total authorized issue is a large one and they run for a long period. As the underlying bonds mature, they are paid off by issues of the Consolidated or Unifying Bonds reserved for that purpose, the bonds being so named because many comparatively small debts are thus consolidated or unified.

Consideration of General, Unified and Consolidated Mortgage Bonds as Investments.—The fact that the total amount of General Mortgage Bonds outstanding is usually large—frequently exceeding $100,000,000—is in one sense an advantage to the investor because, as a result, there is, under almost any conditions, an active market for these issues. They are listed on most of the large Stock Exchanges in this country and some of them on some of the European Exchanges. They become widely distributed among bond-buyers; and, as the number of investors interested in them increases, the demand for them broadens. They may be at any time immediately converted into cash; and, as sales of the active issues occur on the Exchanges almost daily, one knows from the quotations which are published in the papers of all the large cities just what his bonds are worth. On the other hand, the fact that $1,000,000 or more of the bonds may be issued each year is regarded as a disadvantage by many investors. The influx of such a large amount of new bonds into the market may depress the prices. However, it may be said that the railroads, unless they can obtain a fair price for their securities, frequently withhold them from sale, and, too, as the bonds usually appear through the medium of a large banking firm, their distribution is accomplished without unduly affecting the markets. Nevertheless, careful investors favor bonds secured by a "closed mortgage"—that is, by a mortgage all the bonds authorized by which are outstanding and in the hands of the public. There is no occasion for apprehension, in the case of such a security, that the exigent needs of a road for funds, or other causes, will precipitate the throwing upon the market of a large block of the bonds for whatever price

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

they will bring. The demand for bonds, secured by a closed mortgage, is usually great enough to absorb, at fair prices, whatever sales may be made by investors.

First and Refunding Mortgage Bonds.—The First and Refunding Mortgage Bonds are in many respects similar to the General Mortgage Bonds. Most of them bear 3½ or 4 per cent. interest and run from thirty to fifty years. Several large issues of this class of security made their appearance three or four years ago, their creation being a result, in some respects, of the very prosperous business which the railroads were enjoying at that time.

The panic of 1893, as stated above, had resulted in a large number of railroad bankruptcies and reorganizations. The insolvency of a number of roads was due to the fact that many of them were extravagantly bonded; and, when business decreased, with the years of depression following 1893, they were unable to meet the interest on their obligations. Following this period of adversity, however, the roads have been, generally speaking, conservatively managed. Generous appropriations for rehabilitation and improvement have been made from earnings, and, as a result, the credit of our railroads in general has largely improved.

Following 1900, however, the roads found themselves without facilities for handling the traffic which was pressed upon them. They needed additional mileage of double track, new equipment, larger terminals, etc. It also happened that there were a number of high-rate obligations maturing at that time, and it became necessary to refund them. Our general financial situation was exceptionally strong and large funds of capital were available for investment. The railroads took advantage of the situation by creating these First and Refunding Mortgage Bonds. They not only managed to refund the bonds maturing at that time and to make provision for other issues becoming due, but also made the bonds provide funds for other purposes. Our banks and bankers were in an easy position, and had no difficulty in financing an issue of from $50,000,000 to $100,000,000, because they found the public ready to absorb these Refunding Bonds at a comparatively low rate of interest. Inasmuch as many of the maturing bonds were secured by a First Mortgage, the new Refunding Bonds—through the issuance of which the maturing bonds had been redeemed—became partly a First Mortgage Bond. If that part of the road on which they are a first lien is an essential part of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

system and the amount of the issue is not too heavy, the fact that the bonds are secured in part by a First Mortgage makes them attractive to those who favor conservative investments.

But, besides providing for the redemption of maturing bonds, the Refunding Mortgages usually provide for the issuing of bonds for other purposes. Under certain restrictions, an amount of bonds may be issued for extensions and improvements, and in some mortgages a part of the authorized issue may be floated to pay for stocks or securities which the issuing road may purchase. As an instance, the Chicago, Rock Island and Pacific Railway Company issued a part of its First and Refunding Bonds to finance the purchase of $10,000,000 of Chicago and Alton stock. So the mortgage securing these bonds is not purely what its name implies, *i. e.*, a First and Refunding Mortgage.

These First and Refunding Mortgage Bonds are similar to the General Mortgage Bonds in having a broad and active market. Associated with the bankers who were successful in floating large issues of these securities were a number of European banks and banking firms. As a result, the issues have not only a national, but an international, market. Some of them are listed in New York, London, Frankfort, Berlin and Amsterdam. It should be noted that there is a disadvantage in this world-wide market. A financial depression in any one of the foreign centres where the bonds are held may result in low prices for the bonds there, and as quotations in all markets must remain approximately equivalent, may depress the American markets. But a broad distribution of bonds is generally regarded as a point in favor of the issue. It means a larger demand for the securities than could be found in any one market, and therefore greater stability of prices under all conditions.

FINANCIER.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE MOSQUITO THEORY, YELLOW FEVER AND ARSENIZATION.

BY REGINALD B. LEACH, M.D.

More than twenty years ago, Dr. Carlos Finlay, of Havana, Cuba, presented to the profession a theory to the effect that yellow fever is transmitted from a yellow-fever patient to healthy persons by mosquitoes. The Doctor's theory was long a mooted one among physicians, but he persisted in talking about it to all who would listen and in writing about it in every available publication, until, by direction of Congress, the President was empowered and requested to appoint a commission of physicians to investigate it. Drs. Walter Reed, James Carroll, A. Agramonte and Jesse W. Lazear, of the United States Army, comprised the commission.

These gentlemen at once proceeded to Quemados, Cuba, where, in June, 1900, experiments were begun and carried on until this so-called theory was proved to be a fact, and a report confirming Dr. Finlay's assertions was submitted to the Government in the following language: "Natural yellow fever is transmitted by the mosquito, and always and only by the mosquito."

The correctness of this theory being admitted, a practical objection to successful operation under it is instantly obvious. This objection was tersely stated by the New Orleans Board of Health, in a pamphlet circulated gratis in the City of New Orleans in 1905, as follows:

> "The adaptation of protective measures to this important discovery renders the prevention or suppression of an epidemic very simple, *theoretically*. It is *practically impossible* to screen from mosquitoes every case of fever that might be yellow fever, and *it is impossible, also*, to be certain of the destruction of all mosquitoes that may have been infected from mild and *unrecognized cases* of the disease."

The results of the New Orleans epidemic of 1905 bear out thi

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

conclusion. It appears therefrom that the most diligent and systematic effort along the lines of the Mosquito Theory failed to prevent 3,391 cases of yellow fever, resulting in 448 deaths, in that city at that time. It is apparent, then, that, if yellow fever is to be conquered, other methods must be used in conjunction with those of Dr. Finlay.

Preventive medication, by the mouth or by inoculation, is now an accepted medical fact. It is along these lines, therefore, that the solution may reasonably be sought. The purpose of this article is to show that the solution has not only been found, but has been proved.

It consists in what is termed "Arsenization," and, as a theory, it was first presented to the United States Government as the result of researches undertaken by the writer at the request of the late Senator C. K. Davis. A memorial, calling attention to these researches, which was presented to the Senate by Mr. Davis, June 4th, 1898, was duly referred to the Committee on Public Health and National Quarantine, and by them was referred to the Surgeon-General of the Army, with a request for a reply.

On May 7th, 1900, the reply requested was presented to the Congress in what is known as Senate Report 1215, and was to the effect that "there is not sufficient *experimental evidence on record* to justify your Committee in giving the subject any special consideration."

At that time, this reply was apparently justifiable, for, up to 1900, arsenization was little known outside of Brazil; and the assertions of the petitioner of June 4th, 1898, were supplemented only by those of a dozen Brazilian experts in the treatment of yellow fever, whose affidavits may have appeared rather fulsome in their unqualified laudation of a theory which had but twenty thousand practical tests at that time to its credit. To all intents and purposes, therefore, Senate Report 1215 put a quietus upon any prospect of an immediate practical demonstration of arsenization north of the Equator.

The persistence of a few physicians kept this theory before the profession through various medical journals and medical Societies, with the ever-present hope that, eventually, action similar to that taken by Congress to prove or disprove the Mosquito Theory might yet be taken in regard to a theory involving the immunization of everybody exposed either to "natural yellow fever" or to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

those "mosquitoes that may have been infected from mild and unrecognized cases of the disease."

No opportunity for a practical test existed except in the Canal Zone, and the authorities on the isthmus, having adopted the Finlay Mosquito Theory as "the only known rational means of preventing or suppressing yellow fever," were reluctant to test another theory simultaneously, though the two acted along different lines toward a common goal.

In August, 1905, the long-awaited opportunity was presented; consequently, it is now possible to give to the world some facts and figures, concerning both the Mosquito Theory and arsenization—*practically tested simultaneously in the same community under the supervision of Government officers*—that it is believed will prove interesting even to the laity.

These facts and figures are comprised in a report of the practical results following the exhibition of arsenization in New Orleans in 1905. The report comprehends the greatest number of experiments with an alleged protective against a specific contagion ever made, within an equal radius, during an equal time, with such phenomenally favorable results to every individual experimented upon.

In July, 1905, the authorities of the State of Louisiana and of the City of New Orleans requested the Federal Government to assume the responsibilities of the quarantine. This action was apparently imperative because of the rather unfraternal attitude of neighboring commonwealths, whose "shotgun quarantines" threatened commercial destruction for Louisiana.

The State of Louisiana and the City of New Orleans having made suitable financial provision, the President directed the Marine Hospital Service to assume control in the infected districts, and Dr. J. H. White, Deputy Surgeon-General, was placed in charge, with headquarters at New Orleans.

The Mosquito Theory was at once put into practice. The destruction of all mosquitoes, especially the *stegomyia fasciata,* (the only species of mosquito known to transmit the yellow-fever miasm) *plus* sanitary and hygienic measures, was vigorously instituted, and a propaganda of education of the populace in the Mosquito Theory was begun.

The local Board of Health, cooperating with the Federal authorities, appointed physicians of known ability along these

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lines to give lectures nightly upon the new theory of protection, which, up to this time, had never been tested within the borders of our country.

All available halls and opera-houses were utilized, where, with charts and slides and stereopticons, these physicians elucidated Dr. Finlay's theory of yellow-fever prevention or suppression, as it had been demonstrated in Quemados, Cuba, by the above-mentioned commission. The lecturers also not only urged the people to screen and oil their cisterns and to clean up their premises, but requested them to urge their neighbors to conform likewise to the law of their city—thus augmenting the utility of the Mosquito Theory by removing other breeding-grounds and feeding-places for the deadly *stegomyia.*

At the urgent request of the Federal authorities, the City Council of New Orleans enacted a special ordinance, to take effect at once, to the effect that all residents of New Orleans must at once screen their cisterns.

At the same time, with an appropriation fund of $350,000 provided for the special purpose, all idle teams in New Orleans and vicinity were pressed into the service of the officials, and all idle labor was provided with employment. Many volunteer organizations sprang into being; house to house inspection became the order of the day; and much housecleaning was attended to promptly. But the epidemic that showed 54 new cases on August 3rd, 1905, continued to increase in apparent severity, until, on August 12th, the climax was reached, with a report of 105 new cases on that day.

I do not mean to assert that the Mosquito Theory is unfounded. Its practical efficiency is vindicated by a comparison of the epidemic of 1878 with that of 1905, difference in population at the two dates being considered. I do assert, and the figures of 1905 bear out the assertion, that it is inadequate, of and by itself, to do more than mitigate the spread of yellow fever.

On August 3rd, 1905, a new factor entered into the contest. On that date, a letter from the writer was published in New Orleans setting forth the claims of the advocates of arsenization, and stating the manner in which the protective drug was to be used. A few days later, at the request of a number of prominent citizens of New Orleans, the writer went to that city and spent several weeks therein in educating the people along these lines.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The suggested preventive was taken up by the populace of the threatened city in a truly astonishing manner. The practice of arsenization spread so rapidly that, within a few days, "wholesale druggists and jobbers, who usually ordered arsenious-acid tablets from the manufacturers in 100,000 lots, began supplying same in 100,000 lots to the retail trade." Even this soon began to be inadequate to provide the public with the particular prescription it demanded the privilege of testing to the utmost. Jobbers and wholesalers soon ordered in millions, until, upon investigation by representatives of "The Druggists' Circular," of New York, and "The Lumber Trade Journal," of New Orleans, it was learned that between fifteen and twenty millions of this particular tablet had been supplied to the trade of New Orleans within the preceding twenty-three days, "with many more millions to the trade of outlying infected districts."

The figures contained in the reports made by the representatives of the two publications above mentioned, are the only figures thus far obtainable and are more or less meagre, of course, as the epidemic inquisition continued, as usual, until frost.

From these figures it appears that, on or before the date of investigation by the above-mentioned publications, enough arsenious-acid tablets had been disposed of to residents in New Orleans to properly arsenicize at least 165,000 persons; but 11,000 residents had left the city up to that time, and there were 16,000 immunes in the city at that time. The number of the persons thus accounted for, when subtracted from the known normal population of New Orleans, gives a total of not more than 95,000 non-arsenicized non-immunes in that city during the epidemic of 1905, under the alleged protection of the Mosquito Theory, *plus* sanitary and hygienic measures.

While 3,391 persons, of the 95,000 protected only by the Mosquito Theory, contracted the prevailing malady, and 448 of these succumbed to the disease, but *five* (5) of the 165,000 arsenicized persons in the same city, at the same time, contracted the disease; and all of these cases, though "showing unmistakable signs of yellow fever," were exceedingly mild in character, and *all* of these patients *recovered* within a very short time; in fact, it was stated by the father of two of the patients that, though pronounced by the authorities as "cases of undoubted yellow fever," they were at no time confined to their beds.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The result was such that, were it not capable of statistical verification, it would be incredible. The daily number of new cases, which, up to that time, had shown a marked increase over the corresponding period in the epidemic of 1878, (105 as against 43 on August 12th), rapidly diminished, until by August 26th, when arsenization had become general, official reports showed but 31 new cases as against 225 on the corresponding day in 1878.

What caused the sudden checking of the ravages of the plague? Was it arsenization or was it the efforts of the Marine Hospital officials along the lines of the Mosquito Theory? Two things point unmistakably to arsenization as the prime cause. First, the united efforts of the Federal, State and municipal authorities, for several weeks before arsenization was introduced, did *not* prevent a steady increase of the contagion. Its cessation dates precisely from the introduction of arsenization. Second, the practical immunity of arsenicized persons corroborates, and puts beyond dispute, the inference from this coincidence. If the same percentage of illness and death had been maintained among the 165,000 arsenicized, as among the 95,000 non-arsenicized, there would have been 5,890 *additional* cases of yellow fever and 778 *additional* deaths during the epidemic in New Orleans in 1905.

Summarizing briefly, these conclusions rest on evidence which is beyond all denial:

1. The destruction of mosquitoes is but a partial protection. It is a practical impossibility that it be made absolute. Only by an ever-present autocracy, which the temper of our people will not endure, except in the face of extreme peril, can it be maintained. Epidemics will become serious before it can be put in force.

2. Arsenization is practically a complete preventive of the contagion, and an absolute preventive of fatality.

3. Yellow fever is a recurring menace to a considerable section of our country, and a constant impediment to the greatest enterprise in which the United States is now engaged.

Do not these propositions imperatively demand an immediate investigation by the Government? Such an investigation will be asked at the next session of Congress. Whether it will fail of consideration, amid the great mass of business pressed on that body by selfish interests, depends largely on the intelligent people of the United States, to whom the facts are here submitted.

REGINALD B. LEACH.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WHAT AMERICA PAYS EUROPE FOR IMMIGRANT LABOR.

BY CHARLES F. SPEARE.

THERE are two powerful streams, quite reciprocal in nature—the one flowing toward, the other away from, this country—that have created new forces in our economic life while changing the whole current of events in parts of Europe. Both are to-day at high-water mark.

Every year from a million to a million and a quarter aliens are admitted to American ports. Some come to work and save and found new homes; others to work and sweat and save so that, finally, they may relapse into a life of ease in the land of their nativity. They come from impoverished countries, themselves poor. They form the westward-flowing stream.

Out of this stream there is created that other one whose current is eastward. But, whereas the first is of humanity, the second is of gold.

We import labor because we need it. The problem of 1,250,000 immigrants a year is a modest one compared with the problem that would confront our captains of industry should emigration of equal proportions set in. If Europe is to-day embarrassed by a stream which dries up the sources of her productivity, surely we Americans should be encouraged by the fact that it adds so abundantly to ours. It is not, however, of immigration, *per se,* that I propose to treat, but of the newer and less exploited phases of it suggested by the toll, in currency, that the United States pays to those countries from which she draws her laborers, and the imprint on the social and commercial life, of southern Europe especially, of this vast payment which goes to the support of nearly a million families of divers tongues.

Out of the savings of the foreign-born in America, $250,000,000

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a year is now going abroad. The annual increase is about ten per cent. If this money were retained here, it would be sufficient, every four years, to liquidate our interest-bearing debt. It cannot be controlled. It is the *quid pro quo,* the international credit balance, to which the immigrant laborer is entitled if he is worthy of his hire. Until he becomes naturalized there is no particular reason why he should leave his balance here if he prefers to send it home, any more than there is cause for the European manufacturer of silks or wines to bank his surplus in New York when payment has been made him there for his products. The new immigrant labor that takes its place in the ranks each year adds a billion dollars in value to the industrial energy of the country. It is "human capital." Not only does it do this, but it stimulates all domestic markets by creating so much more consuming power. Against it is the annual loss of a quarter of a billion dollars which, by just so much, reduces our foreign credit balances. We get a great deal for what we give.

The annual distribution of this great sum of money throughout Europe is in the following proportions:

Italy	$70,000,000	Russia	$25,000,000
Austria-Hungary	65,000,000	Germany	15,000,000
Great Britain	25,000,000	Greece	5,000,000
Norway and Sweden	25,000,000	All others, including France, Switzerland, Belgium and Denmark	10,000,000

The total foreign-born population of the United States numbers about 15,000,000. The table below gives the division of it by nationalities and the *per capita* remittance of each:

	Number.	Per capita remittance.
Italian	2,300,000	$30.00
Austrian-Hungarian	2,250,000	28.10
British	3,500,000	7.14
Scandinavian	1,600,000	15.00
Russian	1,700,000	14.50
German	3,700,000	4.05
Greek	100,000	50.00

The earliest immigration into the United States was from Germany and Great Britain. High-water mark for those countries was reached years ago, although Ireland again is beginning to send large numbers to our shores. To-day we are dealing with new classes—those from southern Europe. The above figures demonstrate that the tendency to return money to Europe is strongest in the first few years of residence here. Against the *per capita*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

remittance by Germans of $4.05 and by English and Irish of $7.14, races long ago established in the United States, we have the high *per capita* rate of $30 by the Italian, $50 by the Greek, $28.10 by the Slavic peoples and $14.50 by the Russian, all of whom are a relatively new element in our civilization.

Fully one-third of the drafts on Europe are remitted through the Post-office. The postal order is now the most popular form of exchange in use between the United States and Europe. It represents an annual value of $71,000,000. By five year periods, since 1885, and then to 1907, the figures are as follows:

1885	$6,840,358	1905	$47,516,028
1890	13,230,135	1906	63,047,867
1895	12,890,744	1907	71,000,000
1900	16,749,018		

Since 1895 the foreign postal orders issued have reached a total value of $325,000,000 and the number of orders mailed to Europe is represented by the enormous figure of twenty millions. All of this international business goes *viâ* New York. The superintendent of the foreign-money department there tells me that his weekly purchases of exchange on London, Paris, Berlin and the principal cities of northwestern and southeastern Europe amount to $1,500,000. This business is heaviest at Christmas time, when the remittances to Ireland, Italy, Germany and Scandinavia increase materially. The Italians send the largest individual amounts—two recently bought money-orders for $3,000 each—and the Irish the smallest. The steamship "Baltic," at Christmas two years ago, put off at Queenstown mail-bags containing 10,000 registered letters enclosing $125,000. The orders were payable at almost every post-office in Ireland. The average remittance was only two and one-half pounds, sterling. The Hungarian average is about $40, or 200 kronen. Aliens homeward bound buy postal drafts payable to their order at some foreign office. The foreign-born who have no faith in banks also purchase drafts and leave the money on deposit here until needed.

All sorts of outside agencies are employed by those who do not use the Post-office for their international banking operations. A leading one, of course, is the native banker. Through him goes the great bulk of all money sent out of the country. There are nearly 1,000 Italian bankers in the United States. About 300 of them are located in New York. Boston, Philadelphia, Chicago, Denver, New Orleans and San Francisco have their quota. There

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

are several hundred Hungarian bankers, but the majority of them are in the eastern cities and in the coal and iron regions of the Middle West. Small Russian bankers are quite numerous in the foreign quarter of the metropolis, and half a dozen banking institutions in the northwest, in Chicago and in New York handle the largest part of the remittance to Norway and Sweden. Altogether, about $125,000,000 is forwarded by drafts on Europe sold by these private concerns.

The demand on the part of the immigrant for a forwarding agent for his savings has brought into being these native bankers. Originally, many of them were the agents of steamship lines and did a small supplementary business as money-changers. But now their main transactions are in remittances. This trade has grown enormously in the past ten years. There are probably a score of banking firms in New York city alone, whom the downtown financial district rarely hears of, dealing in from $3,000,000 to $5,000,000 of exchange a year. The foreign banker, particularly the small Italian, is the business adviser of his client. His influence with his compatriots is something for ward politicians to reckon with on election day. To his office comes the mail of the unestablished and itinerant immigrant, and through it is spread the gossip of the special province to which the banker caters. It is a general clearing-house for all affairs in the life of the foreigner, and, in small towns and cities, it is his club and lounging-place. The banker exercises a sort of paternal influence over his customer, and, on the whole, treats him fairly. There was a time in the nineties when a goodly proportion of the money deposited with these private concerns, subjected to no banking laws, went directly into their pockets. Occasionally now one hears of an absconding banker. But, compared with the tens of millions of dollars intrusted to them, the percentage that fails to reach its destination is infinitesimal. "I give money to big Russian and he give me red ticket; I no worry," was the way our Polish maid described her occasional international banking transactions.

Then there is the part played in this great forwarding movement of American money by the express companies, which undoubtedly contributes $20,000,000 to $25,000,000 to the whole amount. The remaining $10,000,000 or $15,000,000 is remitted by consular offices, charitable institutions, and associations of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

different sorts—such as the Norwegian sailors' homes and Irish immigrant protective societies—and in currency through the mails. This last form of remittance is not over $1,500,000 to $2,000,000, and takes the form mainly of Italian lira and Russian rouble notes, with a small sprinkling of kronen to Hungary. The actual currency is remitted by the most ignorant and suspicious foreign element, who have no faith in the Post-office or in their native bankers. Sometimes, however, this method is adopted in order to stop the gossip that is excited in every little town in southern Europe when a registered letter arrives for one of the villagers.

The Banco d'Napoli was the pioneer in the business of making remittances for Italians in America. Last Christmas, it received at its head office 32,000,000 lire for distribution throughout the country. Of recent years, however, the Credito-Italiano and the Banco-Commerciale have outrun it and have been drawing very many more drafts than the Bank of Naples. In some cases, the drafts on the banks are transferred on arrival into money-orders payable at the Italian post-offices, and, in others, they are sent out from the head centres of the banks in actual coin of the realm. About the same principle applies to drafts drawn on Russia, Hungary and the other nations receiving their weekly allowances from the United States. There is not a mail-carrying steamer leaving the port of New York, from one year's end to the other, that does not convey a credit, ranging from $1,000,000 to $2,000,000, to some thousands of needy Europeans, whose idea of America is a land where gold lies exposed in the streets and labor has most abundant compensation.

While the direct outgo of money in the form of bank drafts or postal orders may be reckoned at $250,000,000, there is another large item to be considered. It is the funds that immigrants take home with them on their periodic pilgrimages eastward. This will much more than offset the $25,000,000 that was declared in pocket last year by those arriving at American ports. For several months prior to sailing the immigrant ceases to remit. He hoards his savings. His American money he converts, let us say, into lira notes or kronen. This has first to be imported, and the importation of foreign currency assumes a prominent part in the business of the foreign bankers. It has been estimated, for instance, that $10,000,000 of kronen are brought in for the use of the Hungarian people alone, and probably as much more

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

might be put down to the account of the Italian. The Norwegians and Swedes also use a considerable sum of their native money when they start homeward at Christmas.

To one who has not made an intimate study of the immigrant and his way of living, it is inconceivable how he is able to apportion so large a percentage of his actual earnings to the account of savings. It is from the most poorly paid of our people—those who constitute what we are sometimes tempted to term the "dependent class"—that the great bulk of the remittances come. But we must remember that the immigrant is earning, at the lowest, from three to six times his European wage, and that the actual cost of living in his new sphere of life has not greatly increased. His savings do not result from increased economy or personal sacrifices. He has been used to cheap and hard fare in Italy, in Hungary or where not, and he is content to exist in the same way for the first few years on American soil. I know of an Italian working with a railroad constructing gang, and living sometimes in a shanty and sometimes in a bunk-car, who, every three months, remits to Naples $90 of the total of $125 earned. He is buying land. Professor Steiner estimates that the Hungarians send back in the proportion of $15 to every $40 of income per month. This is undoubtedly a fair average, but there are thousands of individual cases where the percentage is much higher. A Hungarian banker in New York who does a business of $3,000,000 annually, and who has twenty thousand clients distributed over the United States representing many occupations, allowed me to look over the cards on which a record of each remittance is made. These go to prove that the Slovaks and the other peoples whose drafts are drawn on Budapest are saving every last penny, and living in circumstances that seem almost animal, in order to accumulate, as soon as possible, what to them would be a competency and permanent financial independence in their home town. Complaint has been made by foreign government authorities that the stress of this sort of existence very quickly undermines the health of the immigrant, and that, laden with gold, but broken in body, he comes home to die of consumption or some other disease which poor nourishment, exposure and unceasing toil finally fasten on the sturdiest of physiques.

Not the least important aspect of the matter is the effect of this wholesale exodus on the countries whence it comes. Emigration

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is a vital economic problem of the day in Italy, in Greece, in Austria-Hungary, in Ireland and, to a lesser extent, in Poland, in the Baltic provinces of Russia, in Spain and in Norway and Sweden. A royal commission is now working here among the Swedes trying to persuade the young men to return to a country that is losing its vitality through emigration. Sections of southern Europe are rapidly being depopulated. But the partial compensation for this great ebbing away of population, this loss of blood and sinew by emigration, is to be found in the money constantly sent into these countries by their expatriated sons. Government officials admit it, even if it is a one-sided kind of reciprocity that takes a strong-bodied laborer from his country, probably for all time, in return for the tiny stream of gold that may, for a few years, trickle back into his home town from earnings in some distant land. For instance, the Italian laborer, with a family of four or five to support, may have lived in extreme poverty on the little piece of land allotted to him. He leaves home and comes to the United States and straightway earns good wages. These earnings in the main go back to Italy; they raise the domestic condition of his family from wretched penury to, at least, moderate comfort. I reckon that the annual Italian remittances from America are sufficient to feed 150,000 families of a half-dozen persons each, or the equivalent of a city of the size of Boston, according to the manner of cheap living in the southern provinces. This is not all. The money returned liquidates debts that have been fastened upon peasants for years; it cancels mortgages and gives a freehold on property that has been in arrears for taxes for over a generation. It provides means to educate the young and to make the declining years of the old and infirm a little more cheerful. But the savings of the immigrants are not exclusively used for the support of those left behind. A good proportion of them is forwarded for deposit in European banks. Pass-books are continually going backward and forward with their credit balances rising. In many cases, savings go for the purchase of real estate and the implements of agriculture. Land in Italy, in Greece, in parts of Hungary and of Ireland, is very cheap. In some places it is bought as an investment; in others, with the idea that the owner will return to his native province and begin his career there anew as a freeholder and not as a tenant. A large proportion of the Ital-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ians who come here have that idea in mind. Only a small percentage carry it into effect. They migrate back and forth for several years, until, finally, the fascination and remuneration of American life hold them down to the soil of this home of the free.

The Russian Jew, fleeing from religious persecution, and the Slovak, Servian, Croatian or Pole abandoning a country that has oppressed him with its political injustice and its economic burdens, and even the Irishman, with dreams of a land of plenty, have little thought of returning home when finally their material circumstances permit it. With the Greek it is different. It is said of him that he never becomes attached to the country of his temporary adoption, but lives always in the hope of returning some day to his native heath. Consequently, the *per capita* remittance of the Greek people is the largest on record. They forward every penny they can spare for the purchase of land and improved property.

Now we come to the unprofitable sequel of this interchange of European laborer for American gold. Obviously, the depopulation of a country heightens the cost of remaining labor. The increase in some cases is fifty per cent. Friends in Germany have told me that the servant-girl problem there has been greatly complicated by stories of large earnings of domestics in America, and by the evidence of prosperity in the dress of returning immigrants. A few years ago, in an Italian village along the Mediterranean, where I spent part of the winter, I well remember the commotion caused by the arrival of some laborers who had been two years absent in the United States. Their daily wage when they left Italy had never been more than two or three lire. In this country they had been able to command from seven to ten lire, with but a slightly increased cost of living. They sowed the seeds of discontent so deeply in the minds and hearts of their village friends that it was almost impossible, for a time, to get the ordinary work of the place done. But this is not all. The inflow of foreign money into impoverished sections increases prices in every direction. This is prominently illustrated in the advance in land, for which immigrants, who never before had possessed a surplus, pay two or three times the real value. As is well known, large numbers of Italian, Hungarian and Scandinavian immigrants go home each winter. Professor Pasquale Villari, a noted Italian economist, has recently pointed out that the sav-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ings which the immigrants from America bring back with them, and on which they live during the period of enforced rest, go chiefly to the taverns, and that the fruit of this ready money is increased drunkenness, epidemics of venereal diseases and a rising percentage of crime and insanity. Greece is already beginning to feel similar economic and social changes, in spite of the fact that emigration from that country did not start in any volume until after 1900, and that the Grecian population of the United States is still less than 100,000. The peasants either go away to America or to the Transvaal, or else sit about in the cafés of Athens and the Piræus and refuse to work. Labor, rents and all the necessities of life have advanced amazingly. Butter is $1.03 a pound, sugar 10 cents, and milk 14 cents a quart. It is said that there are about 1,000 empty houses in Athens, and, in spite of it, rents have risen fifteen to twenty per cent. in a comparatively few years. This paradox is due very largely to the heavy remittances made from the United States and South Africa, which, in turn, have caused a steady decline in the price of exchange. Grecian exchange, which was quoted at 1.57, or 8 drachmas to the dollar, is gradually approaching par. The improvement, not only in Grecian, but in Italian, Spanish, Austrian and Hungarian, exchange in the past five or six years, is, I believe, very closely allied with this whole subject of foreign remittances.

Several attempts have been made by government authorities to check the tendency to excessive emigration. I am inclined to doubt, however, whether it is always looked upon as a national catastrophe. Italy, for instance, has made very elaborate arrangements with her banks to facilitate the receipt and transmission of money-orders from her subjects living abroad, and is just now agitating lower postal rates to remitters. A contribution of 350,000,000 lire *per annum* to the finances of the kingdom is not to be despised. I suspect that there is very little regret exhibited when a peasant, be he Italian, Greek, Slovak or Irish, who is unable to support himself or his family and is inevitably to become a burden on the state, abandons his country for one that can support him and from which he can return sufficient gold to provide for those left behind.

The commercial advantage of this trading of men for gold is surely with the United States. As far back as 1870, it was fig-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ured that the economic worth of a laborer was about $1,200. With the rising scale of wages the past generation, this value to-day may be reckoned at $1,500 to $1,800. Italian economists argue that it costs the state $1,000 to maintain a male subject up to the age of eighteen years. From that period of life he enters the producing class and eventually pays back his indebtedness. But, with emigration depleting the ranks of the producers and the male members of the native family leaving home just at the time of life when they would be able to give their services to their country, the cost of early maintenance is entirely lost. On the other hand, the United States, not having had to bear the burden of cost up to the productive age, has a net gain and accepts the able-bodied foreigner just when he is blossoming into usefulness. Assuming that, of the million and a quarter immigrants that come to America each year, sixty-five per cent. are able to work, we are increasing the potential value of American labor over one billion dollars annually. Against this is the loss of about $250,000,000 in money remittances by the entire 15,000,000 of foreign-born resident in this country, or a ratio to our credit of 4 to 1. In losing a subject whom it has cost $1,000 to sustain, Italy, or any other country, does not suffer irreparable injury; for, at the rate at which immigrants are sending back their savings, the debt to their state is entirely liquidated every four or five years.

Is the present tendency of heavy money remittances a permanent one? I doubt it. By this I do not mean that there is to be any immediate change, although it is quite evident that a period of industrial depression, lasting two or three years, would materially reduce the total figures. It would not only restrict immigration, but would mean a necessity on the part of the wage-earner for confining his income to his personal needs, thus leaving no surplus for other requirements. Indeed, the present unparalleled exodus of aliens, whom a commercial reaction has deprived of work, will mean the cutting of a big slice from the annual contribution to Europe in this fiscal year. My own idea is that a generation marks the limit of home remittances by the individual. This embraces a period in which he may become established in the new country, surround himself with a family, liquidate his old debts and become independent of old ties, which, through aged and dependent parents, bound him to his native

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

country. Furthermore, it is evident that emigration from Europe cannot continue very long at the present pace without exhausting the vitality of the nations so rapidly depopulated. The movement is now at the flood. Then, too, remittances contract by reason of the steady rise in the cost of living here and by the tendency, ever more apparent, of the foreign-born to adopt extravagant ideas.

Emigration has been in progress ever since the children of Israel left Egypt, but not towards a common centre. But there never before existed such a situation as I have tried to describe. It is only possible between countries where the scale of wages is the highest in the world and those others where the scale of living is low. One can easily see what future periods of industrial depression, when labor will be at a discount, will mean to some far-away village in Italy or Hungary, now sustained by an unfailing stream of American money. Unconsciously the United States is doing a great deal to solve the pauper problem in parts of Europe where it has been most difficult of solution. In so doing we help to salve the wound that depopulation makes.

CHARLES F. SPEARE.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE PASSING OF POLYGAMY.

BY REED SMOOT, UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM UTAH.

It is well to be fair in referring to Utah as to other localities. That some differ with me in this attitude, I am convinced from the persistent calumny and misrepresentation which they put forth. But, just the same, I maintain that it is well to be fair—indeed, it is the better course—with Utah as with other States.

Under pressure from within as well as from without, the Mormon Church, in the year 1890, adopted a Church manifesto requiring a cessation of polygamy, or the marrying of plural wives, which it had been practising in this nation against the national sentiment. In 1896, Utah was admitted to Statehood, one condition being that polygamous or plural marriages should be forever prohibited. This condition was complied with in the State Constitution, which applies a penalty of five years' imprisonment and five hundred dollars' fine for each case of polygamy.

In the recent investigation by the United States Senate, in what is known as the Reed Smoot case, it was proved conclusively that since the manifesto of 1890 there had not been celebrated in Utah—or elsewhere throughout the United States, for that matter—a solitary polygamous marriage by or with the consent, connivance, countenance, sanction or approval of the Mormon Church. In view of the fact that permission to engage in the system of plurality of wives, just as leading characters named in the Bible had done, had been taught affirmatively by the Mormon Church for nearly half a century; that many of the Church members had entered into that relation; and that thousands of children had been born and reared in polygamous families,—this strict adherence to the requirements of the manifesto is conclusive evidence of the sincerity of the Mormon Church with reference to its further practice of polygamy in opposition to the national

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sentiment. The Senate inquiry established clearly that polygamous marriages in Utah became a thing of the past more than sixteen years ago, and that no polygamous relations assumed since 1890 have received the sanction of the Church. A certain class of preachers and politicians seem to regret the fact, as it removes a notable excuse for assailing the Mormon Church; but it is a fact, nevertheless, established beyond successful dispute.

Another condition of Utah's admission to Statehood was that there should be no union of Church and State, and that no Church should dominate the State or interfere with its functions. Prior to the manifesto stopping polygamy, there were in Utah two political activities—the People's Party and the Liberal Party. The former was composed almost wholly of Mormons, and the latter of non-Mormons. The party issues virtually were along Church lines, and at least gave the appearance of Church questions dominating the State. In 1891, however, these lines were abandoned, and the national political parties permanently occupied the field, the party divisions being on the national party issues. Mormons as well as other people took sides with one or other of the parties, and officials were elected without respect to religious affiliations.

The evidence in the recent Senate investigation shows, beyond the peradventure of a doubt, that Mormon citizens are as persistent in upholding their political party tickets as are non-Mormons; that they do this without dictation from or interference by the Church; and that, so far as the Mormon Church is concerned, there is in Utah no union with the State nor domination thereof by the Church. The State Constitution contained the required provision on the subject, and it has been observed strictly. Thus the State of Utah, and the people thereof, have kept faith with the National Government in respect to Statehood, and will continue to keep it.

The matter of polygamous cohabitation is quite distinct from that of polygamy. The latter is the forming of new polygamous relations, and the formation of these having stopped by the cessation of plural marriages by the Mormon Church, it is merely a question of time when those previously formed will disappear in the death of the parties. At the time of the Church manifesto of 1890 stopping plural marriages, those already in the polygamous relation found themselves in a new position of difficulty.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

They were good people, against whom no charge could be brought except that, under the idea of religious right, they had entered into the polygamous relation. There was a feeling that these people were entitled to humane consideration; human nature, the ties of kindred and intense religious convictions had to be reckoned with, so the people of Utah did what they believed best under the circumstances.

Prior to 1890, Congress had been most rigid in its attitude against the contracting of polygamous or plural marriages, and also toward the sustaining of those relationships by polygamous families. The Edmunds law of 1882 directed a blow specifically at the latter, which was defined as unlawful cohabitation, and made punishable by fine and imprisonment. Under this law the Government multiplied prosecutions, and there were many convictions. In 1887, the Edmunds-Tucker law added to the stringency of regulations up to 1890, when the Woodruff manifesto was issued. Later, there was no relaxation of the severity so far as it affected the contracting of plural marriages; but the Enabling Act of July 16th, 1894, omitted all mention of unlawful cohabitation, while it required as a condition for Utah's admission to the Union "that polygamous or plural marriages are forever prohibited."

In view of the attitude on old polygamous relationships, as exhibited in the acts of 1882 and 1887, and the toleration shown by the Government prosecuting officers toward these old cases in Utah, this omission by Congress of "unlawful cohabitation" from the Act of 1894 affords a contrast that is susceptible of one construction only.

This same toleration was recognized in the formation of the Utah State Constitution, when Mr. Varian, a non-Mormon who, as United States District Attorney, had been among the most determined prosecutors in enforcing anti-polygamy laws, presented in the Convention the clause which gave effect in the State Constitution to the prohibition therein of polygamous marriages, under heavy penalties, Mr. Varian stating that "it did not touch cohabitation." Such a statement was acceptable only under the tolerant sentiment which had prevailed since 1891. It was assented to when the State Constitution was adopted in 1895 by an overwhelming vote composed largely of non-Mormon citizens.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The condition in Utah, its treatment, and the finding thereon as connected with the Reed Smoot case, are thus briefly and explicitly set forth in the report submitted to the Senate by Senators Foraker, Beveridge, Dillingham, Hopkins and Knox, and endorsed by the affirmative vote of seven out of the thirteen members of the Committee on Privileges and Elections which heard the testimony, and by almost two-thirds of the United States Senate, at the final disposition of the case, on February 20th, 1907; this report says:

"The evidence shows that there were at this time (1890) about 2,400 polygamous families in the Territory of Utah. This number was reduced to five hundred and some odd families in 1905. A few of these families may have moved out of the State of Utah; but, so far as the testimony discloses, the great reduction in number has been on account of the death of the heads of those families. It will be only a few years at most until all will have passed away. This feature of the situation has had a controlling influence upon public sentiment in the State of Utah with respect to the prosecutions for polygamous cohabitation since the manifesto of 1890.

"Whether right or wrong, when plural marriages were stopped and the offence of polygamy was confined to the cohabitation of those who had contracted marriages before 1890, and particularly those who had contracted marriages before the statutes of 1887 and 1882, the disinclination to prosecute for those offences became so strong, even among the non-Mormons, that such prosecutions were, finally, practically abandoned.

"It was not alone the fact that if no further plural marriages were to be contracted polygamy would necessarily in the course of time die out and pass away, but also the fact that Congress having, by the statutes of 1882 and 1887, specifically legitimized the children of those polygamous marriages, it was inconsistent, if not unwise and impossible, in the opinion of even the non-Mormons, to prohibit the father of such children from living with, supporting, educating and caring for them; but if the father was thus to continue to live with, support, educate and care for the children, it seemed harsh and unreasonable to exclude from his relationship the mothers of the children. . . .

"In other words, the conditions existing in Utah since Reed Smoot became an official of the Mormon Church in 1900 have been such that non-Mormons and Mormons alike have acquiesced in polygamous cohabitation on the part of those who married before the manifesto of 1890, as an evil that could best be gotten rid of by simply tolerating it until in the natural course of events it shall have passed out of existence.

"With this disposition prevailing everywhere in the State of Utah among all classes—the Gentile or non-Mormon population as well as among the Mormons—the undersigned are of the opinion that there is no just ground for expelling Senator Smoot or for finding him disquali-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fied to hold the seat he occupies because of the fact that he, in common with all the people of his State, has not made war upon, but has acquiesced in, a condition for which he had no original responsibility. In doing so, he has only conformed to what non-Mormons, hostile to his Church, as well as Mormons, have concluded is, under all the circumstances, not only the wisest course to pursue, but probably the only course that promises effective and satisfactory results."

It may be suggested here that to place the number of polygamous families in the Mormon Church to-day at 400 would be a very liberal estimate; this gives as polygamists about one-tenth of one per cent. of that Church's population—a proportion which is decreasing rapidly. Back in 1904 a census was taken of polygamists in Salt Lake City, showing 74—or less than one to each one thousand of population—and all but two of these were over fifty years of age.

I observe that in a recent issue of "The Independent," Senator Burrows advocates a constitutional amendment to the effect that neither polygamy nor polygamous cohabitation shall exist within the United States. He bases his advocacy thereof upon assertions such as these:

(1) That, since the manifesto of the Mormon Church stopping polygamy, five of the Apostles, A. H. Cannon, George Teasdale, M. W. Merrill, J. W. Taylor and M. F. Cowley have taken plural wives;

(2) That "fully 12,000 members of the Utah branch of the Mormon Church, or 23 per cent. of the whole number, are living in polygamy"; and,

(3) That the records of the Attorney-General's office show that in 1905 there were in Arizona sixteen convictions under the Edmunds law, twelve of this number being for unlawful cohabitation; and that of thirty-one convictions in New Mexico and Arizona a majority were for polygamous cohabitation.

These statements may be measured by the facts which came out during the recent Senatorial inquiry and discussion in Congress. These are as follows:

1. The rumor regarding A. H. Cannon did not become current for some time after his death, which occurred in 1896; the charge against George Teasdale and M. W. Merrill was shown to be untrue; and J. W. Taylor and M. F. Cowley are not members of the Apostles' quorum, having been dropped from it and others sustained in their places at a general conference of the Church;

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

2. Instead of fully 12,000 members, or 23 per cent. of the whole number, of the Mormon Church living in polygamy, the evidence established that in the year 1903 there were 647 polygamist families in the United States, and in 1905 it was estimated that there were about 500, and to-day I am positive there are not over 400 such families;

3. That the Attorney-General, directly correcting Senator Burrows on a former occasion,* officially stated that in the year 1905 there were but ten Mormons convicted in Arizona of polygamous cohabitation, all of them being cases of plural marriages which had occurred previous to 1887, and that not one of the convictions in New Mexico was of a Mormon, or a Mormon polygamous marriage. The truth is that there are only four men, members of the Mormon Church, in the whole of the Territory of New Mexico who are polygamists.†

It would seem highly improbable that the great American nation is eager to amend its Constitution upon the basis of such a misrepresentation of conditions.

The matter of a constitutional amendment in this nation is something more than the subject of a whim; it is a question of grave importance. So far as one specifically affecting polygamy is concerned, the State of Utah can stand it as readily as can other States; but can the other States afford to adopt such a provision merely to point the finger of scorn at a sister commonwealth because of past conditions, when present conditions or future prospects do not require it? A constitutional amendment directed at a practice abandoned seventeen years ago, through which three or four hundred men, now nearing the end of life's journey, are left in the heritage of the polygamous relationship, does not appear extremely consistent.

On a broader plane, however, there may be a call for a constitutional amendment. If so, it should be anything and everything but the self-emasculated proposition put forth by Senator Burrows. If we have an amendment to the National Constitution, let it be on a living question, so as to be of worth to the nation. Come out of the cemetery of the past into the life of the present. In following the President's suggestion, let us go

* See "Congressional Record," Fifty-ninth Congress, First Session, pp. 8649–50.

† See "Congressional Record," Fifty-ninth Congress, First Session, p. 8650.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the full length, and take in the whole subject of the marital relation. If Congress can be trusted with anything on that subject, it can be trusted with all of it, and an amendment something like the following be considered:

"Congress shall have exclusive jurisdiction over marriage and divorce, and all matters relating thereto."

That would include polygamy, polygamous cohabitation, adultery and kindred offences against the law and national sentiment, and could provide a uniform rule of conduct for all that marry. If there be another amendment to the National Constitution, let it be placed on a manly, straightforward, honest, broad foundation; not based on misrepresentation or intolerance. Let us be fair; then we are reasonably certain of being right.

REED SMOOT.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NEW BOOKS REVIEWED.

BY W. D. HOWELLS AND ALVAN F. SANBORN.

THE POETRY OF MR. MADISON CAWEIN*

WHEN a poet begins writing, and we begin liking his work, we own willingly enough that we have not, and cannot have, got the compass of his talent. We must wait till he has written more, and we have learned to like him more, and even then we should hesitate his definition, from all that he has done, if we did not very commonly qualify ourselves from the latest thing he had done. Between the earliest thing and the latest thing there may have been a hundred different things, and in his swan-long life of a singer there would probably be a hundred yet, and all different. But we take the latest as if it summed him up in motive and range and tendency. Many parts of his work offer themselves in confirmation of our judgment, while those which might impeach it shrink away and hide themselves, and leave us to our precipitation, our catastrophe.

It was surely nothing less than by a catastrophe that I should have been so betrayed in the volumes of Mr. Cawein's verse which reached me last before the volume of his collected poems, now at hand in the comely form which a Western house has honored itself in giving the beautiful work of the Western poet. I had read his poetry and loved it from the beginning, and in each successive expression of it, I had delighted in its expanding and maturing beauty. I believe I had not failed to own its compass, and when—

"He touched the tender stops of various quills,"

I had responded to every note of the changing music. I did

* "The Poems of Madison Cawein." With seventeen photogravures from oil-paintings by Eric Pape. Printed by The Bobbs-Merrill Co., Indianapolis, for Ben La Bree, Jr., Louisville, Kentucky. Sold by Subscription. In five volumes, limited to 250 sets. 1907.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

not always respond audibly either in public or in private, for it seemed to me that so old a friend might fairly rest on the laurels he had helped bestow. But when that last volume came, I said to myself, "This applausive silence has gone on long enough. It is time to break it with open appreciation. Still," I said, "I must guard against too great appreciation; I must mix in a little depreciation, to show that I have read attentively, critically, authoritatively." So I applied myself to the cheapest and easiest means of depreciation, and asked, "Why do you always write Nature poems? Why not Human Nature poems?" or the like. But in seizing upon an objection so obvious that I ought to have known it was superficial, I had wronged a poet, who had never done me harm, but only good, in the very terms and conditions of his being a poet. I had not stayed to see that his nature poetry was instinct with human poetry, with his human poetry, with mine, with yours. I had made his reproach what ought to have been his finest praise, what is always the praise of poetry when it is not artificial and formal. I ought to have said, as I had seen, that not one of his lovely landscapes in which I could discover no human figure, but thrilled with a human presence penetrating to it from his most sensitive and subtle spirit until it was all but painfully alive with memories, with regrets, with longings, with hopes, with all that from time to time mutably constitutes us men and women, and yet keeps us children. He has the gift, in a measure that I do not think surpassed in any poet, of touching some smallest or commonest thing in nature, and making it live from the manifold associations in which we have our being, and glow thereafter with an inextinguishable beauty. His felicities do not seem sought; rather they seem to seek him, and to surprise him with the delight they impart through him. He has the inspiration of the right word, and the courage of it, so that though in the first instant you may be challenged, you may be revolted, by something that you might have thought uncouth, you are presently overcome by the happy bravery of it, and gladly recognize that no other word of those verbal saints or aristocrats, dedicated to the worship or service of beauty, would at all so well have conveyed the sense of it as this or that plebeian.

If I began indulging myself in the pleasure of quotation, or the delight of giving proofs of what I say, I should soon and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

far transcend the modest bounds which the editor has set my paper. But the reader may take it from me that no other poet, not even of the great Elizabethan range, can outword this poet when it comes to choosing some epithet fresh from the earth or air, and with the morning sun or light upon it, for an emotion or experience in which the race renews its youth from generation to generation. He is of the kind of Keats and Shelley and Wordsworth and Coleridge, in that truth to observance and experience of nature and the joyous expression of it, which are the dominant characteristics of his art. It is imaginable that the thinness of the social world in the Middle West threw the poet upon the communion with the fields and woods, the days and nights, the changing seasons, in which another great nature poet of ours declares they "speak in various language." But nothing could be farther from the didactic mood in which "communion with the various forms" of nature casts the Puritanic soul of Bryant, than the mood in which this German-blooded, Kentucky-born poet, who keeps throughout his song the sense of a perpetual and inalienable youth, with a spirit as pagan as that which breathes from Greek sculpture—but happily not more pagan. Most modern poets who are antique are rather over-Hellenic, in their wish not to be English or French, but there is nothing voluntary in Mr. Cawein's naturalization in the older world of myth and fable; he is too sincerely and solely a poet to be a *poseur;* he has his eyes everywhere except on the spectator, and his affair is to report the beauty that he sees, as if there were no one by to hear.

An interesting and charming trait of his poetry is its constant theme of youth and its limit within the range that the emotions and aspirations of youth take. He might indeed be called the poet of youth if he resented being called the poet of nature; but the poet of youth, be it understood, of vague regrets, of "tears, idle tears," of "long, long thoughts," for that is the real youth, and not of the youth of the supposed hilarity, the attributive recklessness, the daring hopes. Perhaps there is some such youth as this, but it has not its home in the breast of any young poet, and he rarely utters it; at best he is of a light melancholy, a smiling wistfulness, and upon the whole October is more to his mind than May.

In Mr. Cawein's work, therefore, what is not the expression

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the world we vainly and rashly call the inanimate world, is the hardly more dramatized, and not more enchantingly imagined story of lovers, rather unhappy lovers. He finds his own in this sort far and near; in classic Greece, in heroic England, in romantic Germany, where the blue-flower blows, but not less in beautiful and familiar Kentucky, where the blue-grass shows itself equally the emblem of poetry, and the mouldering log in the cabin wall or the woodland path is of the same poetic value as the marble of the ruined temple or the stone of the crumbling castle. His singularly creative fancy breathes a soul into every scene; his touch leaves everything that was dull to the sense before glowing in the light of joyful recognition. He classifies his poems by different names, and they are of different themes, but they are after all of that unity which I have been trying, all too shirkingly, to suggest. One, for instance, of the longest in the volume of "New World Idylls and Poems of Love" is the pathetic story which tells itself in the lyrical eclogue, "One Day and Another." It is the conversation, prolonged from meeting to meeting between two lovers whom death parts; but who recurrently find themselves and each other in the gardens and the woods, and on the waters which they tell each other of and together delight in. The effect is that which is truest to youth and love, for these transmutations of emotion form the disguise of self which makes passion tolerable; but mechanically the result is a series of nature-poems. More genuinely dramatic are such pieces as "The Feud," "Ku-klux," and "The Lynchers," three out of many; but one which I value more because it is worthy of Wordsworth, or of Tennyson in a Wordsworthian mood, is "The Old Mill," where, with all the wonted charm of his landscape art, Mr. Cawein gives us a strongly local and novel piece of character painting.

I deny myself with increasing reluctance the pleasure of quoting the stanzas, the verses, the phrases, the epithets which lure me by scores and hundreds in his poems. It must suffice me to say that I do not know any poem of his which has not some such a felicity; I do not know any poem of his which is not worth reading, at least the first time, and often the second and the third time, and so on as often as you have the chance of recurring to it. Some disappoint and others delight more than others; but there is none but in greater or less measure has the witchery native to the poet, and his place and his period.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It is only in order of his later time that I would put Mr. Cawein first among those Mid-Western poets, of whom he is the youngest. Poetry in the Middle West has had its development in which it was eclipsed by the splendor, transitory if not vain, of the California school. But it is deeply rooted in the life of the region, and is as true to its origins as any faithful portraiture of the Mid-Western landscape could be; you could not mistake the source of the poem or the picture. In a certain tenderness of light and coloring, the poems would recall the mellowed masterpieces of the older literatures rather than those of the New England school, where conscience dwells almost rebukingly with beauty. Perhaps if I name Mr. Cowein with Mr. James Whitcomb Riley, and with both those poets as true and fine, Mr. J. J. Piatt and Mrs. S. M. B. Piatt, I shall be making my meaning clearer. No doubt, there are others who will not at the moment name themselves to me, but keep themselves for the reader's less hurried recollection, and with whom he will like to group these. If the Middle West had produced no poets but these, she would have uttered herself in poetry in a voice not mistakable for any other. Each of them is an artist, and with their native quality in common, each has a peculiar charm. It is enough to say that Mr. Cawein's poetry has a beauty which is enchantingly its own, and with a family favor recognizable in the work of the others, is otherwise akin to that only as it is akin to what is beautiful in all poetry.

W. D. HOWELLS.

RENE BAZIN'S NEW NOVEL.*

"'AH! there you are, father! I am not late?'

"'Prompt as a soldier, my friend, like myself: I have only just come.

"General Philippe de Meximieu was standing on a convex, pebbled strip between green slopes, awaiting the arrival of Michel. . . . He allowed his son to approach without making a movement towards him: he was preoccupied; his back was turned to his château, and he was looking fixedly, with an air of distrust and surprise, towards the Southwest, into the arch formed by the leafless oaks over the forest road.

"'Did you hear that?' he demanded.

"'What?'

"'What they are singing. Listen, they are coming this way.'

"The force of the wind and the accidents of the ground had prevented Michel from hearing before. In the woods to the left, powerful, ardent, musical voices were singing the '*Internationale*.'* Most of the words

* "*Le Blé Qui Lève.*" By René Bazin. Paris: Calmann-Lévy.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

were drowned in the depths of the wooded solitudes; a few, however, came with perfect distinctness to the ears of the two men. . . .

"'Scoundrels!' said the General. 'Is it possible to sing such horrors?'

"'They are drunk.'

"'That is one vice the more.'

"'Drunk with the hatred which has been poured out to them in overflowing measure. But how many there were who saw only the label of the beverage! And that was beautiful!'

"'You think so? The murder of officers?'

"'No, fraternity.'

"'Listen!'

"The wood-cutters approached. The wind bore their cries on its cold wings. At times, these cries seemed to be hymns, of which they had the amplitude and the prolonged resonances in the forest. Besides, the approaching night rendered the air attentive. All at once, to the left, a group of men appeared in a narrow path almost perpendicular to that in which M. de Meximieu and his son were standing. They were marching in disorder, and one of them flourished a bugle before him. . . . When they reached the crossroads and perceived the two bourgeois motionless at the entrance to the Fonteneilles road, they hesitated. The song was arrested on the parted lips of the young men in the van. But Ravoux, President of the Union of the Wood-cutters of Fonteneilles, took up the couplet with a voice metallic and knotty as a hickory bough.

"His companions imitated him. A flame of joy illumined their eyes, the malicious joy of vexing and berating the adversary with impunity. Still most of them lifted their hats as they passed, and Ravoux was of the number. . . . They disappeared in the direction of the village.

"Another band larger than the first appeared.

"'They come from my woods,' said M. de Meximieu, 'and they insult him who gives them bread! Do you know these fellows?'

"The heads emerged from the shadow one by one.

"'All,' Michel replied.

"The men advanced, singing or mute, lifting their hats or remaining covered.

"Michel named them as they went by: Lampoignant, Trépard, Dix-neuf, Bélisaire, Paradis, Supiat, Gilbert Cloquet,—Cloquet saluted with averted head—Fontroubade, Méchin, Padovan, Durgé, Gaudlion, etc. . . .

"A young voice launched anew one of the vindictive couplets of the vindictive chanson. Through the immense, deceitful peace of the forest the words coursed and issued forth to proclaim afar that the worst passions of politics had invaded the rural regions."

This fragment from the opening chapter of René Bazin's new novel, "*Le Blé Qui Lève*," strikes the key-note of the volume and prefigures adequately its trend. The father, General Philippe de Meximieu, owner of the Château of Fonteneilles, is an absentee

* A sort of twentieth-century "Carmagnole"; the rallying song of the contemporary European revolutionists.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

landlord for whom his inherited lands are nothing more than a source of revenue. The son, Michel, who administers the estate, loves every inch of its ground, and takes a keen interest in the welfare of the humble laborers who earn their daily bread upon it. Furthermore, Michel is a sort of Christian Socialist. He has a lofty idea of the social rôle of the landed proprietor, and yearns to bridge the constantly widening chasm between the rural laborers and their employers by instilling into both a higher and a Christian conception of life. But he knows that he is suffering from an incurable disease which condemns him to an early death, and he despairs of being able to make any material contribution himself to this transformation. Among Michel's day laborers, however, one Gilbert Cloquet,—he who in the defiant march of the wood-cutters through the forest saluted with averted gaze,—appreciates his motives, although he disapproves his methods, which he does not comprehend; and this one is destined, without suspecting it, to succeed him as a propagandist of the application of the teachings of the Gospel to the strained rural conditions.

Cloquet is a leading member of the Wood-cutters' Union of Fonteneilles, in the mission of which he believes with all the intensity of a strong nature. Michel is not opposed to the Union, but he desires to see it imbued with his own noble aspirations—Christianized, in a word. In the course of a conversation with Cloquet in the wood, he explains his attitude:

"It is the fashion to flatter the laborer and abuse the noble. The truth is, Cloquet, that we have both sadly deteriorated. We are suffering from the same malady; indolence and pride. All the hatreds come from that. . . . What makes me angry, what gives me pain, and what causes me to pity you is the impossible ideal of injustice that is held up to you, an ideal so ignoble and petty that not one of the sturdy wood-cutters of the France of yore would have deigned to listen to it. Your wings have been clipped by your chiefs, as if you were barnyard fowls. Appetites have been given the place due to justice, hatred the place due to love. But listen! All this can be changed. If the Union shall one day be baptized, if there shall be a benediction of the mounting sea, that day, Gilbert, living or dead I shall be with you, I shall applaud, I shall believe in a better, that is to say, a more noble, land, in a new chivalry, in a return of the saints among a blessed people. As true as the sun is shining, it is for that I am hoping."

By virtue of what ordeal Gilbert Cloquet, wood-cutter, came in time to adopt the belief and attitude of Michel de Meximieu,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

noble, it would take too long to recount here. Suffice it to say that, after a succession of novel trials and tests (which take him far afield and which terminate in a Belgian monastery), he returns to Fonteneilles, forms an alliance with the village priest and (at risk of expulsion from his Union and even of bodily violence) announces to his free-thinking, priest-baiting fellow unionists that he has seen a new light and that he proposes to follow it. His exposition of the new order of things is brief but unequivocal:

"I have no ill to say of any one. My heart has not changed for the worse. Quite the reverse. But I have learned that we did not have life, and I have come back to tell you where it is to be found. I shall tell it to you once, twice, a dozen times, as long as I shall be in the world. No one shall prevent me. I mean to stay with you in the Union. The justice I have always desired I still desire, but now I know that it is more beautiful than I dreamed, and I am going to it."

"*Le Blé Qui Lève*" contains picturesque and dramatic portrayals of tumultuous labor-meetings in the woods and the village cabarets; sermons (less terse than Gilbert's) which might well be spared; and a touching love episode. It also contains descriptions of rural scenery and delineations of rural character which no other living French novelist could match.

Some years before René Bazin had given the full measure of his literary power in that magnificent prose-poem of the Vendée "*La Terre Qui Meurt*" (1899), which won him a seat in the French Academy, the critic, René Doumic, said of him: "We like him for the delicacy of soul and elevation of feeling shown in his books, and for his courage in remaining a pure and decent writer, while he is, at the same time, a truthful and clear-sighted one. . . . He inclines toward realism whose tone, at once frank and true, is a new note in our literature."

Granted that if all French novelists had been of the exceedingly scrupulous type of René Bazin, we should have missed some of the choicest passages in French letters; nevertheless, it would be a great pity if there should be an utter dearth of French novelists capable of depicting in all its marvellous strength and charm the almost patriarchal family life of the provinces of France. Because M. Bazin does this easily, spontaneously, inevitably even, as a provincial who loves the provinces and has always remained faithful to them, his writings deserve to be better known than they are in America.

ALVAN F. SANBORN.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WORLD-POLITICS.

LONDON: BERLIN: WASHINGTON: ST. PETERSBURG.

LONDON, *December, 1907.*

IT was with a pang of very real sympathy that all Englishmen, and in particular all members of the House of Commons, without distinction of party, received the news of the Prime Minister's sudden illness; and it is with a not less genuine solicitude that the country watches the course of his convalescence at Biarritz. "C.-B." has been one of the great successes of his Government. No member of it, unless it be Lord Elgin, whose administration of the Colonial Office falls decidedly below the Chamberlain standard of practicality and understanding, and whose personality is not an inspiring one, can be said to have actually failed. Many of them have fortified their titles to public confidence with unlooked-for success. Mr. John Burns, for instance, has shown himself an eminently capable and statesmanlike President of the Local Government Board. He is one of the most honest men in English public life—honest, I mean, in the sense that he never minces matters, is not to be lured by any will-o'-the-wisp, however attractive, and does not hesitate to tell the working-classes that there is little the State can do for them compared with what they can do for themselves, and that, so long as they waste $15,000,000 a week on drink and gambling, the scope for political and social reforms through the medium of legislation is distinctly limited. Like M. Millerand, when he joined the Waldeck-Rousseau Cabinet, Mr. Burns has found in his old colleagues of the Labor Party his bitterest opponents; but on public opinion at large his rugged sanity and outspokenness, his quite remorseless zeal in exposing the petty jobbery and corruption of local Boards of Guardians, and the courage he displays in resisting all schemes which he regards as prejudicial to the virility and self-reliance of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

masses, have made an admirable impression. The country looks to him to effect one of the most needed and difficult of English reforms—a thorough overhauling and reconstruction of the Poor Law administration. Another Minister whose appointment was regarded two years ago as something of an experiment, but who has abundantly established his qualifications for office, is Mr. Lloyd George. All Englishmen subscribe to the conviction that the country possesses in him a second Chamberlain of energy, enthusiasm, courage and businesslike capacity.

Mr. Haldane, again, the Minister of War, has achieved a success which, as I believe, though I quite admit it is too early for any final judgment, will ultimately rank him among the greatest of military reformers. He has, at any rate, produced and carried through a comprehensive and original scheme, thought out to its minutest detail, flexible and interdependent in all its parts, for remodelling the armed forces of the Crown on a basis of local patriotism and local organization. It is a scheme which only the people themselves, by their own efforts and their own enthusiasm, can bring to fruition; and I do not think the common opinion wrong which regards it as virtually the last, as it is by far the most reasoned and thoroughgoing, attempt of the voluntary system to prove itself capable of bearing the immense and complex burden of Empire. No Minister, of course, can expect to win popularity, in such a country as England, by any project, however brilliant and successful, of army reorganization. Whatever scheme he proposes, half the experts are sure to condemn it, and the general public, I fear, regards the whole subject as unutterably dry, technical and repulsive. But the more serious mind of the country has already, I think, worked round to the conclusion that Mr. Haldane's plans are the best solution of Great Britain's military problem that the national conditions and the national repugnance to any form of compulsory service permit of, and it acclaims their author as one who has done more than any of his colleagues to revive the somewhat tarnished reputation of Liberal Governments for works of bold and effective administration. Equally solid and equally unspectacular have been the achievements of Sir Edward Grey in the Foreign Office and of Mr. Morley at the India Office. The routine of these departments is so absorbing that neither Sir Edward nor Mr. Morley has been able to spare much time for

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the House of Commons. The country has not complained. Trusting both men and feeling an implicit confidence in their policies, it has allowed each to work in silence and in secret; and it absolutely endorses the lines they have respectively pursued. In Parliament, however, there has been some muttering over the seclusion in which these great offices are administered; and it is certainly a remarkable fact that, under the most Radical House of Commons that has ever assembled in Great Britain, the conduct of foreign affairs should have been shrouded in an unusually baffling and almost impenetrable reserve, and that the country should have found itself time and again committed to courses which its representatives have had no opportunity of discussing. But neither in Parliament nor out of it will you find any serious disposition to deny that Sir Edward Grey and Mr. Morley have sensibly increased their hold upon the confidence of the country; nor will any dispassionate observer dispute that with their names should be bracketed that of the brilliant and untiring Under-Secretary for the Colonies, Mr. Winston Churchill.

But beyond all his colleagues it is "C.-B." himself whose development has most impressed the country. In the House of Commons his ascendency has mounted beyond all expectation; and, within his own Party, which is not by any means an easy one to manage, his unruffled patience, good-humor, kindliness and common sense have proved an emollient of the highest efficacy. He has all of Mr. McKinley's aptitude for smoothing things out, for reconciling the most opposing views and personalities to a common concentration upon the *via media,* and for governing by the incommunicable touch of urbanity. Everybody likes him; nobody can quarrel with him. After the *finesse* and elusiveness, almost, as it seemed, the deliberate disingenuousness, that marked the last two years of the Balfour Ministry, the country has turned with gratitude and relief to "C.-B.'s" palpable sincerity and straightforwardness, his genial, unpretending humor, and his complete incapacity and disdain for ambiguities, dissimulation and shifty tactics. If it does not rank him as one of its great men, it certainly ranks him as one of its most amiable; it has observed almost with surprise the ardor with which he has risen to the exacting duties of the Premiership, and the admirably mellow and dignified spirit in which he has discharged them; and, while it does not pretend that he owes his present position to any

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

commanding powers of intellect or of character, it entirely agrees that he has well and honorably earned it and fills it with a success that many abler men have failed to achieve. He has, in short, the affection both of his Party and of the country, and a Prime Minister who has that, and who has won it, as "C.-B." has won it, by the resiliency and dependableness of his character, by a pluck that was never discouraged by any amount of political adversity, and by a natural sweetness of disposition, finds his task enormously simplified. "C.-B.'s" leadership has been a very real and effective thing. He radiates the good-humor which makes agreement easy; he is by far the most experienced Parliamentarian in his Party; and he has mastered the art, which with such a factional following as his is of inestimable value, of leading with the minimum of friction and with next to no appeal to the authority of his mere *ipse dixit*. His temporary retirement, especially at a time when the Cabinet should be arranging the legislation for the next session, is a grave inconvenience to his Party; his permanent retirement would immensely impair its harmonious efficiency.

It was thought, two years ago, that "C.-B." would take an early opportunity of retiring to the House of Lords. But the development of events, and especially the definite raising of the whole question of the Upper Chamber, have made such a course impossible. If the Prime Minister retires at all, it will be as a Commoner, and because his age and health no longer enable him to stand the incessant strain of the Premiership. That time, I hope and believe, is still far distant, but his momentary breakdown has inevitably led to a good deal of discussion over the problem of his successor. It is not likely, in my judgment, to prove either an immediate or an anxious problem. Mr. Asquith, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, seems clearly designated as the man upon whose shoulders the mantle will fall. He had a brilliant career at Oxford and followed it up by an even more brilliant one at the bar. Entering Parliament at the election of 1886, he quickly made his mark, so quickly, indeed, that Mr. Gladstone appointed him Home Secretary in 1892. In that position he showed not only extraordinary capacity, but very real courage in certain of the measures he adopted for the maintenance of internal law and order. There has been no better Home Secretary furnished by either Party for half a century. In

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

foreign affairs, Mr. Asquith belongs to the Rosebery school of Liberal Imperialism. During the Boer war he took a line that, though it made him unpopular with the more extreme sections of his Party, commanded the instant assent of the average Englishman. But it was not until the fiscal question arose that Mr. Asquith stamped himself upon the country as a man of really exceptional powers. Such a controversy precisely suited his trenchant, lucid style. He at once took it up with enthusiasm, dogged Mr. Chamberlain's footsteps from town to town, and answered him speech for speech, and point by point, until at times it almost looked as though the issue would resolve itself into a gladiatorial combat between the two men. As a debater, Mr. Asquith stands in the front rank, his clearness of argument and exposition, his nimbleness of mind, and his command of concise and clear-cut language being surpassed by no one on either side of the House. The two Budgets that he has produced as Chancellor of the Exchequer have been, on the whole, sound performances. He has paid off $115,000,000 of the national debt, has stopped borrowing, and has introduced the principle of distinguishing for the purposes of income-tax assessment between earned and unearned incomes. He has also taken the momentous and, as many think, the dubious step of setting aside a sum of money as a nucleus for a non-contributory old-age pension fund. The general sense of the country approves, I believe, Mr. Asquith's administration of the national finances, and has an undoubted admiration for his many and varied talents. He is not, however, a popular man, being somewhat too close and self-contained to strike the imagination of the masses. The Labor men, especially, regard him as precisely the kind of Whig whom it is their business to get rid of. But the predominant feeling of both the country and of the Party will, I think, rally to his side when the question of "C.-B.'s" successor becomes an actual and immediate issue.

The Government, which according to Mr. Chamberlain's calculation was to have been "hissed off the stage in a few months," has now been in office for two years. If it were not to add a single other measure of legislation to its long list of achievements, it would still go down to history as a great reforming Government. It is apparently as strong as ever in the good-will of the nation. Its opponents are still a remnant, and a remnant divided

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

against itself. In spite of an immense parade of unity on the platform, every one is well aware that the great Party which Lord Salisbury left intact has been reduced by Mr. Balfour's nervelessness and Mr. Chamberlain's precipitancy to a chaos of warring factions, and that the moment of reconciliation is not yet within measurable distance. Mr. Balfour continues to be hailed alternately, and sometimes simultaneously, as a lukewarm Free Trader and an unconvinced Protectionist. The resolute Tariff Reformers behind him abhor his cautious tactics, are exasperated by his indecision, his provisos, his subtleties and his glosses, but have to acknowledge that he and he alone can lead the Party. The Unionist Free Traders find comfort in enrolling an occasional new recruit—Lord Cromer is the latest and by far the most distinguished adherent to their cause—and in reflecting, first, that Mr. Balfour has not yet capitulated to the Protectionists and, secondly, that Tariff Reform shows not the smallest sign of gaining ground among the electorate. These are omens that might well encourage the present Ministry to look forward to a long and undisputed lease of power. But the Liberals, too, well as they have done, find themselves menaced by a gathering cloud of anxieties. The next session will be a critical, perhaps a decisive, one. Not only are the Government pledged to tackle the licensing question and thus to come to grips with the wealthiest and the most consummately organized "interest" in the country; not only have they announced their intention of bringing in a new Education Bill, with a prospect of repeating the fierce strifes and ultimate failure of 1906; not only is Mr. Birrell already at work on the thorny problem of an Irish University Bill; but the Government are resolved also to push their campaign against the Lords a step further by reintroducing the measures that were rejected or mutilated by the Upper Chamber during last session, and submitting them once more to the judgment of the Peers. Moreover, there is the possibility—some think it the probability, and others the certainty—that the recent wave of commercial prosperity has well-nigh spent itself, and that Great Britain, like Germany and the United States, stands on the threshold of the lean years. And finally—and these are the most disquieting portents of all—the breach between Liberalism and Labor shows no sign of contraction and many of distention, and the propaganda of Socialism grows daily in activity

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and effectiveness. It may, I think, be now taken as part of the established framework of English politics that there should be a third Party in the field, calling itself Labor or Socialist, drawing votes from both the two historic Parties of Liberals and Conservatives, fighting a politico-economic issue on a class basis, and appealing to the proletariat with an ever-increasing intensity and success. What this development foreshadows no one can say with any definiteness, but that it must profoundly affect the fundamental conditions of English politics, the two-party system, and the kind of issues on which they have hitherto been divided, seems indisputable. The intervention of a third and uncompromising Party may mean the transfer of many Liberal seats to Conservatives. It may even mean that a minority of the electorate will acquire control of the Government of the country. Both the old Parties repudiate Socialism; but the instinct of the average voter, if he regards the defeat of the Socialist candidate as the transcendent object to be aimed at, will be to vote for the Tory rather than the Liberal. It is significant that already Liberal Journals are discussing the advisability of introducing the system of the second ballot or the alternative vote. English politics are in a very interesting, because a very fluid, condition; but the form in which they will eventually solidify is at present beyond speculation. The breaking away of the English masses from their old moorings, and their irruption into politics as an organized force, are phenomena as essentially revolutionary as any that have appeared during the past few years in Russia itself.

BERLIN, *December, 1907.*

THE German Emperor's visit to England last November constituted one of the most interesting events in the sphere of European politics during the latter part of the year. The Kaiser's reception by the King and the British Royal Family put an end to the insinuations of those who had failed to appreciate the significance of the meeting between the King and the Emperor at Wilhelmshöhe in the summer, while the respectful cordiality of the city of London's welcome afforded eloquent and convincing testimony of the absence of any malice or grudge on the part of the British nation against its Imperial guest.

What the results of the Imperial visit to England will be it is, of course, at this juncture, impossible to predict. Although

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nominally official, the event in itself cannot fairly be described as in any sense political. At one time, indeed, it was suggested that the Imperial Chancellor would accompany the Emperor to England; and, if Prince von Bülow had not been detained at home by Parliamentary considerations of the most urgent kind, he would undoubtedly have received in all quarters the welcome to which his eminence entitles him. For a variety of reasons it is to be regretted that the Chancellor was unable to attend his Imperial master, since Prince von Bülow's urbanity and statesmanlike qualities would have conciliated the sympathies of those in England who have not yet had the advantage of being brought into contact with him. Indications, however, have not been wanting that in Berlin, as well as in London, it appears to have been felt that the Imperial Chancellor's presence at Windsor and in the city might lead to undesirable and unwarranted speculations with regard to the objects of German policy which would be incompatible with British as well as with German intentions.

The *entente cordiale* between England and France is one of the constant factors in the European situation, and the series of agreements which have sprung from the understanding between the two Powers has only served to make its stability and necessity more clear. If Germany can be brought to recognize that these developments are not directed against her, but are solely designed to safeguard existing conditions, England and France will be the first to welcome this change of view. The French for their part will acknowledge the benefits which they may expect from an improvement in Anglo-German relations, while a subsidence of strained relations between Germany and France would be equally gratifying to the English people. The sooner all attempts to undermine or in any way to impair the efficacy of the mainspring of British policy are abandoned as useless, the better it will be for the peace of Europe and, indeed, of the whole world. The re-establishment of confidence is chiefly to be desired as the most potent element in this consummation. The lines of British policy are fixed, but they do not run counter to any legitimate German aspirations, and it is only upon the basis of a recognition of this settled fact that any lasting understanding between Germany and England can be achieved.

The present improvement in Anglo-German relations in particular is being generally treated in this country as an eminently

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

favorable opportunity for developing the aspect of German World-Politics which is reflected in the creation of a powerful navy. German aspirations in this direction are perfectly well known, but the ultimate end in view is less clear. The German Navy League is persistently endeavoring to inculcate the belief that, until Germany is able to measure herself with Great Britain on the seas, German development will be repressed and blighted. A natural development on the part of a great and growing nation cannot be arrested by purely material forces. This fact is universally admitted by all sensible Englishmen; and, in so far as German expansion is not consciously promoted at the expense of Great Britain's position in the world, the German element is free to assert and to establish itself wherever economic superiority is on its side. But legitimate and natural expansion of this kind is something quite different from the designation of England as the objective of elaborate and painstaking schemes culminating in the creation of a navy which shall be a match for the British fleets. The chauvinists have long ago ceased to mask their aspirations, and the function of the once purely "defensive" German Navy has now become avowedly "offensive." The fairy-tale about the foreign-service cruisers which were necessary for the protection of German commerce has long been abandoned in favor of the new theory that German commerce must be protected by a fleet of battle-ships in the North Sea. Those who still consider it worth while to dissemble smoothly allege that a strong German Navy will operate in the interests of peace. The German public has been skilfully inoculated with the idea that, if, for example, during the Morocco crisis, Germany had been able to exert "diplomatic pressure" on England by mobilizing a strong armada in the North Sea, the course of those fateful negotiations might have been less humiliating to Germany. The inference is suggested that, at moments of crisis in the future, the menace of the German double squadrons at Wilhelmshaven will impose an effectual check upon any tendencies of British policy which Germany may consider to be detrimental to her "interests."

The extent and character of the present naval proposals before the Reichstag are eminently suggestive. The navy law of 1900 was amended in 1906, and this year's bill makes it manifest that the "law" of only a few years ago is a highly elastic conception. The ostensible effect of the reduction of the age limit for battle-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ships from twenty-five to twenty years is to add three battle-ships to the strength of the German Navy during the period from 1908 to 1917. But, in reality, the sum of the proposed changes is far more extensive. It is sufficiently significant that this alleged total increase should have been apportioned to the first four years of the period for which the programme of construction has been framed. This proceeding lends to the programme for 1908, 1909, 1910 and 1911 a degree of compactness in marked contrast with the skeleton scheme which is presented as the "programme" for the succeeding six years. It is easy to imagine what arguments will be adduced in 1911 in favor of maintaining the rate of construction. By that time the question will have become one of economic necessity, quite apart from any considerations which the political situation at the moment may dictate. The future, however, may safely be left to take care of itself. The immediate programme shows that, in addition to the usual complement of auxiliary craft, four ships of the largest class are to be laid down each year for the next four years. Furthermore, there are indications of a financial character, in the manner in which the grants for construction are apportioned, that these new vessels are destined to represent a considerable advance upon anything still on the stocks. The four battle-ships laid down at the rate of two each in 1906 and 1907, and the large cruiser laid down this year will certainly be outclassed in design and execution by the ships of the new era. According to the provisional scheme, only one battle-ship and one large cruiser are to be laid down each year after 1911; but even now nobody in this country doubts that fresh demands of at least equal magnitude will be made by the Government as soon as the proper moment has arrived. The financial cost of this expansion is, of course, stupendous, especially since every provision for the new ships in the shape of dock and harbor accommodation is simultaneously being made. The torpedo and other submarine arms of the service, as well as the coast defences, are also being perfected and proportionately developed. Those who have listened with discerning ears to the throbbing activity at Kiel, and who have watched the transformation of Wilhelmshaven into a first-class naval base on the North Sea, will appreciate the nature and the significance of the effort which is being exerted. Moreover, there is more method than would at first appear in the seeming recklessness with which these

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

formidable armaments are being built on credit. As far as justification is concerned, there is enough money in Germany to build twice, or even three times, as many ships as are actually projected. But, unfortunately, as a result of the inextricable tangle to which the finances of the Empire and of the Federated States have been reduced, the country cannot be taxed to its full capacity; and, so long as the States retain the right of direct taxation to the exclusion of the Empire, the situation is practically equivalent to an entail. The German Government, however, is evidently convinced that the chief thing is to build the ships, and that the bill can be settled later on, perhaps at somebody else's expense. By 1911 naval expenditure will have reached the enormous figure of £23,000,000 ($115,000,000). Even if the British vote of £31,000,000 ($155,000,000) for 1906 were fully effective, there would be considerable ground for vigilance on the part of England. But as a matter of fact only some £29,000,000 ($145,000,000), or even less, can be ranked as effective expenditure, since a large ineffective vote for the payment of the *personnel* has to be deducted from the British budget. As Germany, under the conscription system, gets her men for practically nothing but the cost of their maintenance, the German vote is almost entirely and exclusively effective, while pensions and similar items are charged to a separate account. It is perfectly evident that some adequate reply will have to be made to the German increases. What form the British programme will assume remains to be seen; but it is likely to be sufficient to preserve the present proportion between the two navies.

WASHINGTON, *December, 1907.*

IT is doubtful whether anybody in Washington has read the whole of the President's Annual Message, which comprised some thirty thousand words, and was loaded with copious quotations from the writer's preceding utterances. What Mr. Roosevelt had to say about the financial and industrial situation attracted, of course, the most interest. It was rather disappointing to find that his discussion of currency reform was made up largely of a repetition of the references to the subjects in a previous Message, including the allusion to ex-Secretary Shaw's scheme for an "emergency currency." After all, however, it is for Congress, and not for the Executive, to deal with the ques-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion of currency reform; and, if the President refrained from recommending a central bank of issue, which is advocated in some quarters, it may have been because he doubted whether the country is ready to welcome another United States Bank, modelled more or less closely on the Bank of England, or the Imperial Reichsbank of Germany. There was nothing particularly novel in his suggestion that it might be well to determine whether bank officers and directors ought to lend the money of depositors to themselves, or in the opinion that trust companies ought to keep larger reserves than they do, and should be subject to the same rigorous supervision as are national banks. He wants to give the Federal Government power to inspect the accounts of trust companies, as it does those of national banks, and he also proposes a Federal supervision of big industrial combinations, which, he thinks, could be secured on the ground that those combinations are engaged in interstate commerce. In spite of the fact that the United States Supreme Court, in the second Cleveland Administration, pronounced an income tax unconstitutional, the President recommends with peculiar earnestness a graduated income tax and an inheritance tax, manifestly assuming that the tribunal, as now constituted, might be prevailed upon to reverse its former decision. Nobody in Washington knows what reason, if any, there is for the assumption, although there has been no lack of rumors on the subject. We scarcely need say that army and navy people, who are so extensively represented in Washington society, highly approve of the President's proposal that the regular army shall be enlarged and made more efficient by increasing the pay of both officers and men, and that the navy shall be augmented by the addition of four battle-ships. It is true enough that such an addition is needful if we are to retain the second place in the list of naval Powers, for the German naval programme, which was revised the other day, provides that three battle-ships of the most formidable type shall be begun every year up to and including 1911. There are also solid reasons for Mr. Roosevelt's recommendation of an extension of the Ocean Mail Act of 1891 providing mail subsidies, in order that the United States mail may not be dependent on foreign steamship lines to South America, Hawaii and certain other countries. The President's approval of the establishment of post-office savings-banks is

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

based, doubtless, on the success of the institution in Great Britain. The reference to Japan is courteous, and calculated to promote the negotiations for a curtailment of the inflow of Japanese labor into our Pacific ports. It is obvious that friction would be averted if such curtailment could be brought about without recourse to the enactment of an exclusion law by Congress. We observe, finally, that in what he said about the tariff, the President seemed to take for granted that no general revision would be attempted during the remnant of his Administration, but he did advise the immediate repeal of the duty on wood pulp, a suggestion that ought to make him *persona grata* to newspapers. We have passed over certain recommendations because there seems to be not the slightest chance of their early embodiment in legislation. For example, Mr. Roosevelt proposed to reduce the number of accidents to railway employees by providing Federal inspection of railway-working; he wants Congress to pass an Employers' Liability Law, and to empower the Federal Government to intervene in labor disputes, to regulate child labor, to check the destruction of forests and the engrossing of water-power by industrial corporations, and to prevent the accumulation of land in too few hands.

The Message was not received with lively interest by Congress, nor with a chorus of approval by the country. The organs of the Republican party for the most part refrained from criticism, although, notwithstanding the seductive proposal about wood pulp, some of the newspapers known to be controlled by high protectionists did not hesitate to express a doubt as to whether the Dingley Tariff ought to be touched in any point at the present time. It is questionable whether a single one of the President's recommendations will be embodied in legislation at the present session of Congress, except that of the addition of four battle-ships to the navy. So far as can be judged from the editorial articles of independent newspapers, and from published interviews with business men, Mr. Roosevelt's suggestions by no means carry the weight which they would have possessed a year or even six months ago. The weeks spent by the President in bear-hunting in Louisiana seemed to have had much the same effect upon his fortunes that the months wasted in Alexandria had upon the fate of Julius Cæsar. It was certainly unlucky for the former that the financial crisis should have broken out

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

during his absence from Washington. The reaction against him, as the generally recognized author of "The Roosevelt Panic," has been promoted by the fact that he seems not to be in a repentant mood, and certainly in his Message he has not brought forth fruits meet for repentance. So far, indeed, as the States lying between the Sierra Nevada and the Mississippi River are concerned—States which have, collectively, but few electoral votes—he is apparently almost as popular as ever, but elsewhere he has lost prestige and influence with a suddenness and to an extent for which there is no parallel in American history. Andrew Jackson, of course, was responsible for the panic of 1837, and Benjamin Harrison for that of 1893, yet neither of them suffered greatly in public esteem because neither was in the White House when the catastrophe occurred. It is Mr. Roosevelt's mishap that the inevitable outcome of his systematic effort to destroy popular confidence in corporations was not postponed until 1909, which many close observers of the financial and industrial situation believed would be the case. As things are, Mr. Roosevelt cannot escape accountability. Nor would it be surprising if his second administration should end under a deep cloud. He may console himself with the remembrance that George Washington, who received every electoral vote for the Presidency, had the mortification of knowing, when he went out of office on March 4, 1797, that the Representatives in Congress of his own State, Virginia, had publicly thanked God that they were rid of him. No other elected President has ever been subjected to such humiliation. The changed sentiment with which Mr. Roosevelt is regarded by his countrymen will naturally be reflected abroad, and the foreign tour to which he is said to look forward may not prove a triumphal march.

There were those who said of a famous historical personage that nothing in his public life so became him as his mode of leave-taking. There are many American citizens who hold that Mr. Roosevelt's reassertion of his determination not to accept a nomination for a third term is the finest act he has performed. We are not so sure that it is the finest, but that it is the most prudent we have no doubt. The present President has probably no idea of the breadth, depth and intensity of the feeling against a third term in this country. As a matter of fact, had he been renominated in 1908, anybody could have beaten him, for it is

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the height of absurdity to suppose that what was denied to the hero of Appomattox would have been granted to the pseudo-hero of San Juan. Not only would Mr. Roosevelt have failed to be elected in 1908, but he would no less certainly fail in 1912. By the latter date, moreover, other men will occupy the foreground, and Mr. Roosevelt will find himself relegated to the middle distance. His day is drawing to a close.

ST. PETERSBURG, *December, 1907.*

THE Russian Premier, having prevailed at the voting-urns, is rising rapidly in the Duma. To the authority invested in him by the Tsar he now adds the influence which the support of a great parliamentary party confers. He has become a personage to be reckoned with, the one man whom the Russian upheaval has elevated high above the dead level of the crowd. His strongest claim to distinction, however, is his personal integrity, his fine moral fibre. People have learned to respect his motives, to believe his word, to rely on his promise, and that amounts to a patent of nobility in a community where esteem is considered to be degrading, where beliefs are dying and motives for the best actions are naturally set down as base. The worst that people say about him is that he lacks the power which he would use so well if it were invested in him, that he is being utilized by the court as a new sign-board for the old bureaucracy, a decoy to lure honest patriots back into thraldom. And it cannot be gainsaid that certain appearances lend color to this assertion. If M. Stolypin has not been broken by the storm, it is undoubtedly because he can bend to the wind. More than once he is believed to have given way to the court, and to have silently abandoned a measure which he had warmly advocated.

But no adequate reason can be advanced why the court should not influence the Premier, if it can first convince him, and it is but fair to assume that in each case alleged by M. Stolypin's antagonists, he was persuaded that the specific which he was prescribing would fail of its good effects.

M. Stolypin is the hero of the day. The third Duma is his creation, he is its master; and if it carry out his behests representative government will never again cease to be a Russian institution.

By a series of clumsy but effective expedients, which ultimate

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

success would probably justify or condone, M. Stolypin succeeded in having a Duma elected which seems able and willing to work. The great majority consists of men who profess their readiness to render unto the nation the things that are the nation's, and unto the Tsar the things that are the Tsar's—as soon as they can distinguish which is which. And their efforts to effect this distinction produce the line of cleavage between them. Thirty-three, who, still at heart partisans of the autocracy, are docile to a hint from above that they must not be more monarchistical than the monarch, form the Extreme Right of the Duma, and no longer clamor for the abolition of this institution. Another group of the Right, nearly five times more numerous, is composed of men who harbor no desire for a return to absolutism pure and simple, but still regard the Tsar as the source of all real power in the State. Neither of these parties is wholly after the heart of M. Stolypin, who prefers the hundred men called "Octobrists," whose starting-point is the October Manifesto, who are monarchists by conviction, friends of order and Russian patriots. Although his agents helped members of each of those parties at the elections, the preference was generally given to the latter. And now that the legislative laboratory erected by Stolypin has begun to work people are anxious to learn whether it will distil the elixir of national life.

The Duma met on the 26th of November, and spent that day in wrangling as to whether the form of Government is constitutional or autocratic. As a vote of thanks to the Emperor, for the grant of a representative assembly, had not been passed by either of the two foregoing Parliaments, it was judged meet that the Third Duma should make good the omission of its predecessors, and that as large a majority as possible should be got to vote for the motion. Now as several sections of the Opposition would join in expressing their thanks, the first part of the address voiced this sentiment only. In the second part the Duma assured the Tsar that it would use all its knowledge and experience to strengthen the fabric of the Empire renovated by the October Manifesto. In the first part of the document the Monarchists wanted to have the Emperor's title of Autocrat mentioned; in the latter half the Constitutional Democrats and others insisted that some allusion be made to the constitution.

To Alexander Ivanovich Goochkoff, leader of the Octobrists,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fell the arduous task of reconciling these conflicting interests. And he was impatient to win his spurs. M. Goochkoff has been sneered at by his countrymen because he comes of a stock of hard-working tradespeople. Happily for himself, M. Goochkoff lives at a moment when artificial barriers between class and class are being swept away and every citizen may become the product of his own works. Those of Goochkoff were multifarious. Restlessness was his characteristic trait, and love of adventure the mainspring of his actions. He was successively a justice of the peace, a member of the Moscow municipality, a nomadic student of the famine in Central Russia, a member of the municipal board, an enemy of Turkish misrule in Asia Minor.

The Octobrists, about a hundred all told, form the political centre of the Duma. From the Constitutional Democrats they differ principally by their opposition to home rule, their determination to maintain the unity of the nation and the supremacy of the Russian race and by their fidelity to monarchical principles. From the Right they differed, until quite recently, by their loyalty to the constitution given by the October Manifesto, and by their willingness to enfranchise the Jews. But at present they admit the equality of Jews and Christians in principle only, holding that the moment for applying it has not yet come. On the other hand, the Monarchists having stretched a point and given a half-hearted assent to the "constitution," the differences between the parties are become somewhat shadowy. Consequently, by means of a permanent arrangement with either party to the right or left, or by alternate alliances now with one, now with the other, the Octobrists have it in their power to keep together a working majority until the Duma's legal term of existence has expired.

Goochkoff's maiden speech on the question: Is Russia an autocratic or a constitutional State? made a deep impression on every one. Conciliatory in tone, elastic in principle, it was almost artistic in form. A product of the head, it left the heart unmoved. He delighted the Monarchists by insisting on the necessity of thanking the Tsar for his generosity, and he charmed the Constitutional Democrats by declaring that the Emperor had limited his own rights and that the present form of Government is constitutional. "The Emperor," he said, "is become more free because the constitution has delivered him

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

from court camarillas and the hierarchy of bureaucrats." And the orator wound up hopefully by giving utterance to his conviction that in two or three years all dissensions on this question will have disappeared. After this act of faith and hope, it was peculiarly appropriate that a Bishop should pronounce an unctuous allocution asking that the Emperor should be addressed by his title of Autocrat of all the Russias.

After hours of discussion in which over fifty deputies took part the title "Autocrat" was excluded from the address, and the address was voted towards midnight by all present, except the extreme Right, the Poles and the Labor Party.

Next day a veritable storm of rage or exultation broke out all over Russia. The liberal press gloated over the "abolition of the autocracy" by the nation, and conservative journals anathematized the assembly that had "betrayed the sacred cause of monarchism." Members of the Extreme Right called for or prophesied the dissolution of the Third Duma. The Court allowed it to be known that the dissatisfaction of the Emperor was intense and well grounded, because the responsible leaders might have carried the address without provoking a debate, and could in any case have eliminated the question of autocracy. But having raised it, court Monarchists argued, consistency, if not loyalty, ought to have made them give the Tsar his legal title. Had they not themselves, each member in turn, signed a solemn declaration of allegiance to the Autocrat of all the Russias? And if they thus acknowledged the title with unanimity, what would be the effect of merely omitting it in a document which is only an act of gratitude?

The fanatics of the Right and the Left possess one solid advantage over the Octobrists, who are now the caryatides of the "renovated Empire." The ideals of the so-called "visionaries"—a democratic republic and an absolute monarchy—are quite possible, whereas an autocracy is inconceivable whose head is a constitutional ruler, and whose supporters consist of constitutionalists, who, holding that the monarch's power is limited yet boundless, can truly say with Tertullian, "We believe because the thing is impossible."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE EDITOR'S DIARY.

Of Yankees and "Yankee Doodle."

REFERRING to certain sneering and intemperate allusions to this young land by English publicists reproduced recently upon these pages as indicative of the true British attitude toward us, Mr. Andrew Lang chides us gently for assuming that such journals as the "Academy" and the "Saturday Review" are really representative, and makes fresh declaration of the unselfish friendliness to us of our older cousins. Such assurances, especially from a source so distinguished, and presumably authoritative, find ever a ready welcome among those of us who continue to regard ourselves as lovers of peace and concord; and it was with peculiar satisfaction that we prepared to accept these in particular while sojourning temporarily within His Majesty's dominions. Imagine, then, the distress of mind which ensued, almost immediately, upon our finding that on that garden spot discovered by the Spanish Bermudez, but appropriated by the English Somers, American boys are prevented from attending schools by English lads who congregate in great numbers for the deliberate purpose of hazing them. Granting readily the essential brutality of youthful exuberance the world over, and conceding, of course, the non-participation and even perhaps the disapproval of their elders, the dominance of resentful prejudice in the breasts of these young Britons of the better class against their American relatives can only be held to mean that the disappearance of the traditional distrust and dislike which grew out of the Revolution is not yet complete. Whether, if the cases were reversed, American schoolboys would behave with like discourtesy we would not venture to assert; if common reports of actual experiences be correct, probably not; but positive protestation would ill become one in whose eyes the red coat is still

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nearly, if not quite, as hateful as it was in those of the embattled farmers at Lexington. Such we imagine the effect to be, as English writers bitterly complain, of the accounts of the struggle against oppression formerly given in our primary school-books and reiterated with emphasis by teachers at the multitude of "four corners" throughout the length and breadth of the land. For the gradual but, as we are informed, certain elimination of these resentful teachings from the school-books of to-day we should, of course, be duly grateful—and probably are.

There is delightful irony in the fact that the most derisive term applied by an English lad to an American boy is "Yankee." True, since our own Civil War, during which social amenities prevailed to a limited degree between "Yanks," on the one side, and "Rebs," on the other, the word has taken on a new colloquial meaning; but, as originally used, it actually stood for "English," having been coined by the Indians, whose guttural limitations restricted their pronunciation of "English" to "Yengees," then "Yangees," from which "Yankees" easily followed. Even though Thierry's theory be accepted, that "Yankee" is a corruption of "Jankin," a diminutive of John, applied by the Dutch of New York to the residents of New England, the reference was, of course, to Britons, and therefore, from their view-point, necessarily complimentary—as "John Bull" is or even "Tommy Atkins." Moreover, as early as 1713, it was held to denote great excellence, being used at that time by the Cambridge farmers at their auction sales of "Yankee good horses," "Yankee cider" and the like.

Possibly that exasperating tune, "Yankee Doodle," had something to do with the discovering of the term "Yankee" by the English—and, if so, one could hardly blame them for harboring a prejudice against the Yankee nation, although even at that, if we admit their own pretensions, they had only their own stupid selves to blame. It has ever been the wont of the British upper classes to speak opprobriously of their stronger antagonists and sometimes, if we may be so bold, of their betters.

When Charles the First ascended the throne a ditty familiar in the nurseries of high society was "Lucy Locket," afterwards known in New England as "Lydia Fisher's Jig," and running like this:

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"Lucy Locket lost her pocket,
Lydia Fisher found it;
Not a bit of money in it,
Only binding round it."

A smart Cavalier, adapting the jingle to political conditions, produced the following:

"Nankey Doodle came in town,
Riding on a pony,
With a feather in his hat
Upon a macaroni."

A "doodle," according to Murray, was a simpleton, "a sorry, trifling fellow"; a "macaroni" was a knot in the ribbon. The particular Nankey characterized thus derisively in this case was Oliver Cromwell. The next adaptation appeared in 1766 in connection with a caricature ridiculing William Pitt for espousing America's cause, and incidentally sniffing at the French and Virginia negroes thus:

"Stamp Act! le diable! dat is de job, sir:
Dat is de Stiltman's nob, sir,
To be America's nabob, sir,
Doodle, noodle, do."

It was but natural that shafts of the wit of the period should be aimed at the uncouth American soldiers; and there was much hilarity in the British camp in Boston when an officer-poet recited the lines which became the real "Yankee Doodle," beginning with the familiar verse:

"Father and I went down to camp,
Along with Captain Goodwin,
Where we *see* the men and boys
As thick as hasty-*puddin'*"—

and continuing with the well-worn references to "Captain Washington," "My Jemima," *et al.*, after the well-known fashion designed to "take off" the provincials thus:

"There was *Captain* Washington
Upon a *slapping* stallion,
A giving orders to his men:
I *guess* there was a million.

"And then the feathers on his hat,
They looked so *tarnal fineа*,
I wanted *pockily* to get,
To give to my Jemima.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"And then they had a *swampin'* gun,
As large as log of maple,
On a *deuced* little cart—
A load for father's cattle.

"And every time they fired it off
It took a horn of powder;
It made a noise like father's gun,
Only a *nation* louder.

"I went as near to it myself
As Jacob's *underpinnin'*,
And father went *as near agin*—
I thought the *deuce* was in him.

"Cousin Simon grew so bold,
I thought he would have cocked it;
It scared me so, I shrinkéd off,
And hung by father's pocket.

"And Captain Davis had a gun,
He *kind* a clapped his hand on't,
And stuck a crookéd stabbing-iron
Upon the little end on't.

"And there I *see* a pumpkin-shell
As big as mother's basin,
And every time they touched it off
They scampered *like the nation*.

"And there I see a little keg,
Its heads were made of leather:
They knocked upon't with little sticks,
To call the folks together.

"And then they'd *fife away like fun*
And play on *cornstalk* fiddles;
And some had *ribbons* red as blood,
All wound about their middles.

"The troopers, too, would gallop up
And fire right in our faces;
It scared me almost half to death
To see them run such races.

"Old Uncle Sam *come* then to change
Some pancakes and some onions
For *'lasses cakes*, to carry home
To give his wife and young ones.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"I *see* another *snarl* of men
A digging graves, they told me,
So *tarnal* long, so *tarnal* deep,
They *'tended* they should hold me.

"It scared me so, I *hooked* it off,
Nor slept, as I remember,
Nor turned about till I got home,
Locked up in mother's chamber."

Some years before, a British army surgeon stationed at Lake George had composed one or two sneering verses entitled "Yankee Doodle," and Ethan Allen, whose liking for stirring melody was stronger than his taste for classical music, promptly appropriated the tune, so that the fifers and drummers at Dorchester were fully prepared when they received a copy of the Boston composition, and the shrill tune became, probably for all time, our favorite national marching air. It is essentially English, as we have pointed out, but only in our judgment as adapted; in any case, rightly or wrongly, we prefer to accept Duyckinck's declaration that it was taken by the predatory British from an old Dutch harvest-song whose refrain ran:

"Yanker didee *doodle* down
Didee dudel lawnter,
Yankee viver, voover, vown,
Botermelk und Tawnter."

The British officer-poet, however, is entitled to the credit of having made the first use of "Uncle Sam" on record, although there is no indication that he meant it to refer to the States then united only for defensive purposes, thus leaving to the Albany pork inspector the high honor traditionally accorded him for sardonic humor in the use of a branding-iron.

Disregarding considerations relating to the origin of the appellation or traditions enveloping it, what is the true position of the Yankee of the present day? Should one, so called, feel abased or exalted? Has he cause for shame or reason for pride? Assuming an intermingling of vices and virtues in the typical human, which in his case dominate? Does his traditional meanness pale before the glint of his stern morality, or have both been so modified as to be virtually lost in a flabby present? Verily, is there to-day a Yankee living, as Yankees once did live, with malice towards all and charity for none whose existence seems to be unrighteous?

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

This is a fruitful topic peculiarly inviting to our commercially consanguineous Jew and Scot; but, for the present, contrast may well be confined to the race whose physical robustness and dogged determination have served to triumph over the presumably superior intellectual attributes of their racial rivals. We should say, then, that, in common estimation, the Yankee is keener, shrewder, less dogmatic and more capable of sharp practices than the Briton. In combat, commercial or other, the two are about evenly matched, the exceptional quickness of the one nearly, if not quite, balancing in effectiveness the developed brutality of the other. True culture sits lightly upon both. In minor morals the Englishman excels; in major probities the Yankee is incomparable; the former being certain, the latter undecided, as to the future life. Neither could ever be agreeable to or sympathetic with the other. There is, therefore, little to choose between them in a personal way, especially if one be indisposed to regard his fellow humans with persistent gravity; but as to the effect of the national characteristics of each of the races, respectively, upon its activities and destined purposes, there is no possibility of comparison. Despite the splendid personal freedom which he has achieved and of which he justly, though too frequently, boasts, the Englishman has become so wholly imbedded in the feudal system represented by a landed aristocracy that he is a worse stifler of progress than a Turk. All in England to-day is paternal; therefore, socialistic and absurdly tentative in the face of threatening revolt against wrongs, not fancied, but real, because mentally stultifying by decree of those exercising fatuous authority.

It is idle to deny that, owing to a recent welcoming of political charlatanry, temporarily, at least, eclipsing all party organizations and their concomitant steadiness, like perils confront us in America, but even this briefest of great national existences has already indicated that subversion of a political ideal based upon encouragement of individual enlightenment and achievement is at least remote, if not in point of fact impossible. The self-reliant Yankee made this nation, welded it together successfully, and thus far, in every crisis, even to the recent financial cataclysm, has not only proved equal to, but dominated, every emergency. His habitation is no longer New England, but the entire country, as these late events have proven, and his civic creed con-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tinues to be faith in the supreme ability of mankind, educated to think and act individually, to solve all human problems.

Thus the Briton! thus the Yankee! Between the two, diffidence characteristic of a young and modest segment of the greatest of human races prohibits choosing.

In Defence of Widows and Spinsters.

WE acknowledge the receipt of the following earnest communication from Albany, New York:

"SIR,—Your unwarranted and uncalled-for attack upon a respected and respectable class of the world's population entitled 'No Necessity for Widowhood,' must awaken a feeling of indignation from those who realize the falsity of its statements.

"Lips, long silent in the grave, seem to bear witness against this arraignment of those whom grief has touched, and dear folded hands, years ago laid to rest, seem raised in protest against this indictment for crime of those honored women not only of this age and clime, but of all ages and all climes, who have been the faithful, the intelligent home-keepers 'for better, for worse, for richer, for poorer,' till death has severed the bond.

"God said of woman, in the beginning, 'And she shall be a helpmeet for man'; not the hysterical, weeping, ignorant, hectoring creature described by the author, but a helpmate. This she has proved to be in the majority of cases from that time to this. And men of all ages have borne witness to the noble type of good, heroic womanhood.

"'As one whom his mother comforteth' is the compendium of all that is solacing to a grief-stricken heart, whether that mother be one whom sorrow has touched, or one fortunate enough to keep by her side, through life, the companion who has chosen her.

"First, as a wife is woman assailed; 'Practically all she knows is that milk is good for babies.' Can it be possible, in these days, when women in every branch of study are pressing up abreast of the men, when cooking-schools, dietary, hygienic conditions and nursing are receiving attention from all classes of women, both rich and poor, that one can imagine such a condition as depicted by the writer of 'Wilful Ignorance' and hectoring hysteria because a husband fails to eat as much as usual?

"Then the writer goes on to state: 'Women kill good providers by the score and then hold themselves fit objects of sympathy because, forsooth, of their self-imposed widowhood: we have no patience with such persons.' Never, probably, in all the history of the world has such a brutal sentiment been expressed. The writer states that 'Men are chivalrous.' Surely here, then, is an exception to the rest of humanity.

"Such women have not held themselves to 'be fit objects of sympathy.' On the contrary, as the world has known in all ages, most of the women

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

whom grief has stricken have, though with aching hearts, bravely taken up the burden dropped by their companions and have cheerfully and courageously gone on, in the thoroughfare of life, making the days sunny for the little ones left to their care, or bearing the burden of others too weak to sustain them. Woman has asked not for sympathy, nor for assistance; but when one would arraign her as a murderess because of her tender ministrations to the dead and gone she says: 'Touch me not; let my griefs make me sacred.'

"Why are there widows, then? God, not Mr. Harvey, is alone able to answer that question. Were one to express an opinion, it might be stated that ordinarily men choose women younger than themselves—sometimes by many years. It is in the course of nature, except for accident, that the younger should outlive the elder.

"Then, besides, men are out in the world, exposed to accidents, danger and disease thousands of times while the wife, keeping the home, is not so exposed.

"Men usually eat more heartily than women, eat at untimely and variable hours; eat at restaurants and hotels, where food is not always hygienic; eat when overheated or tired; drink, sometimes, when nature has called 'enough.'

"Another reason: a man usually marries a second time not, let us believe, because of lack of love or faithfulness to the lost one, but because ordinarily, having known the tender ministrations and home comforts which only a wife can give, he cannot endure life when deprived of them and so seeks another helpmate.

"'Primarily, therefore,' the author sums up, 'women are responsible, through ignorance, for the multiplication of tobacco hearts, and the filling of married drunkards' graves.'

"Could there be a more terrible arraignment? If, as Shakespeare depicts, when night comes wronged spirits return, surely, for one who could write such words, there must some time come a night when, in long procession, with white and haunting faces, the women of all ages and countries, faithful wives and loving mothers, who have made home happy, cured the sick, forgiven the outcast, reclaimed the lost, whose very name has been a talisman to hold back from evil the tempted soul, among them these whom grief has touched perhaps, but has purified—these souls must pass before his vision, and with dark forecastings of the future for one who thus lightly arraigns as murderesses those faithful ones who, even though touched by sorrow, have not in 'wilful ignorance,' but in greatest wisdom, as conceded by all ages, made home what it is,

> "'By heavenly pity and sweet sympathy,
> By patient kindness, by enduring truth,
> By love, supremest in adversity.'
>
> "FRANCES V. HUBBARD."

Another lady writes:

"SIR,—Referring to your latest injunction to spinsters that it is

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

'better to marry a bad man and reform him,' I ask permission to say that the risk is too great, as carefully collected statistics have proved that only one man out of every ninety-eight and one-half ever reforms. The accusation that any one who takes this risk is a fool is not easily refuted. Another man possessing, perhaps, equal ability with yourself in making wise remarks said:

"'As the husband is the wife is: thou are mated with a clown,
And the grossness of his nature will have weight to drag thee down.'

"Then, too, the Society for the Survival of the Fittest is emphatic in its protests against foolish females or bad males marrying at all, not to mention their marrying each other. According to the well-tested law of heredity, the marriage of these two types can only produce fools and degenerates, classes of which all observant students of human nature now declare we have an abnormal number."

St. Matthew XVIII: 12, 13; St. Luke XV: 4, 7.

The Family of an Undertaker.

We have received the following letter:

"SIR,—In your cheerful generalization leading up to a grave consideration of 'the helpful little book' entitled 'The Funeral,' you, one is assured, do an unwitting injustice to a business which is, by its very nature, harmless and necessary. You say, 'We have often wondered how it would seem to be an undertaker.' Why say this? Why wonder, when you conclude your paragraph with this positive non-wondering statement: 'Gradually they come to regard themselves as apart from other men,—and so, perhaps, they are, as a sexton is, or a hangman'? How do you know they so come to consider themselves any more than every man comes to consider himself as apart from other men, aside from his natural dependence on both the living and the dead? Who can claim that dependence in a greater degree than the undertaker?

"Then, O generalizer! you confess: 'Of the undertaker's home life we know practically nothing.' That is a very fitting confession. You place yourself beyond absolution, however, by your questions following:

"'Does he romp with his children?'

"'Does he ever have any children?'

"'As a matter of fact, did any one ever hear of the son or daughter of an undertaker?'

"Now, the children of Mr. Mould no doubt would have worn black mittens in the cradle if only Charles Dickens had thought of it. But the Moulds were cheerful people. I am sure you are glad you met them.

"It so happens that I once knew an undertaker who was a gentleman; a man who had the respect of the community in which he lived. He left a fair name to his children; and his fellow citizens few of whom are now living, knew him for an upright, honorable man. Many of his

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

personal charities became known after his passing. Those that are hidden may account for the smallness of the estate which he left. Those of his children whom I knew were certainly never ashamed of their father, nor the fact that his business was such as none of us would probably select, as a matter of taste.

"His oldest son, of whom, of course, no one has ever heard, carries on the business. Grandchildren of the men for whom the father conducted their last affair of consequence look to the son to do their own work when the time comes. He will do it; is doing it every day. He has not grown rich as he happens not to be a Funeral Director.

"He has no sumptuous chapel with stained glass memorial windows or other fashionable flummery. So, Mr. Editor, if you want a nice, cozy, comfortable funeral, large or small, I can direct you to the right shop. So much for the oldest son.

"The second son was a merry villain. Never have I known a more humorous, daring fellow. Friends came to him without effort. Clever with his pencil and his pen, his sketches and verses, written on margins of school-books, and, later, on menus and theatre programmes, are a well-remembered delight.

"It was he that told the story, with accompanying sketch, of one of those funeral-going old ladies who, living in a populous parish, went to the wrong funeral and had a really good time. Then finding that the funeral she desired to attend was coming down the street, she went to that and had as good a time as the circumstances allowed. If only that scrap of paper showing the church, the coming and the departing funerals, the old Frenchwoman and the fat Irish priest were in my possession, I would send it to you.

"This same son attended a masquerade as a long, lank, black undertaker, with a neat black pasteboard coffin—decorations, skull and bones—under his arm. So little was he ashamed of the business that brought him his bread, butter and gruesome jest that when last heard of he was high in the conduct of one of our great railroads.

"One of the very jolliest evening parties I ever attended was under his father's roof. The undertaker, his wife and sufficient small fry to have satisfied our Chief Magistrate were on view early in the evening, as was sometimes the case in those days when the opening of a home to guests meant hospitality. I remember no black mittens or gloomy looks, only a good, jolly evening.

"The daughter, who was beautiful, well-educated and had inherited from her French mother and Irish father both charm and wit, has made what is called, I believe, a successful marriage. She was a delightful girl, and very popular with the young men and women who were fortunate enough to know her.

"The place in which this family lived was a city where a real society existed long before some of our more pretentious cities came into existence. The social tone was taken from old French families, some of them of historic name. When one of these old French ladies,—they were all old,—gave a reception it was as if the social kingdom of heaven

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

were opened to the invited. The family of whom I am writing you took their place in these assemblies by right of birth, breeding, manners and education.

"Just how the younger generation are coming on, either in a social or any other way, I do not know. They tell me that the old town has changed in these days of extravagant refinement. Probably the snobs are all dead, and the old French ladies have dried up and blown away.

"You happened, you see, to ask your question of a reader who had known one undertaker and his family. So in justice to the craft with which I have no affiliation whatever, and with which I desire no early relations, I feel that I need send no apology with my reply. Instead, I wish to thank you inasmuch as the reading of your diary has brought freshly to my mind a pleasant family, almost forgotten.

"H. B. KAYE.

"EVANSTON, ILLINOIS."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED